

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 4.—OCTOBER—1910.

---

## I.

### THE MORAL VALUE OF COLLEGE WORK.

JEFFERSON E. KERSHNER.

College courses and college work have passed through a series of changes. History shows that in these matters, as in all matters of human interest whether physical or intellectual, there is a process of evolution going on. This process of evolution had certain stages wherein it appears as if a kind of finality had been reached. That is, the course of the evolution was not uniform and in a regular gradient but at times rose rapidly and then seemed to remain as if on a level plane. On this account there were certain stages where the methods and the matter were much alike. These levels of different elevations produce the periodic character of the development; and so we have periods divided by epochs of the history of education, periods of courses of education which periods have certain special characteristics peculiar to these times. It is not our purpose to go into a history of education for which we have not now the time; and we fear that if we had the time it would be only dwelling on the past which to be sure has its effect on the present; but it is the present that is of most concern to us. For it is the present methods of work that bring the results to this generation, not the past methods nor even so much the influence of the former methods.

In order to get a few landmarks we may say there are ap-

proximately three stages in the educational work of the middle age and the modern world. That is, there were three ways of conducting the educational work which led to, and include, our present college, and college university, courses.

The first one was that course in which grammar, rhetoric and dielectic were taught, known as the trivium. This was the original course for which the degree of bachelor of arts was given. This course was then a university course. When this course was supplemented by a more advanced course looking more specifically towards the courses in law, theology and medicine, the only professions at that time, the degree of master of arts was given. That is, the recipient of the degree of bachelor of arts was looking forward to the arts as he became proficient in the elements of learning, and then, as he proceeded, he took somewhat more specifically a course in arts and became a master. Then naturally followed the professional courses for which also the degrees of bachelor and master or doctor were given.

Then came the humanistic movement brought about by the introduction of the Latin and Greek languages and their literature. This brought about the so-called humanistic training. By the introduction of the masterpieces of the Latin and Greek languages, their grammar and their literature became almost the only branches of learning it was considered worth pursuing. This course was considered in those times a very practical training. A concise statement of the claims of the educational value of these branches and what these claims led to, is perhaps best given by Professor Painter in his *History of Education*.

He says: "It is maintained that the study of the ancient languages is unequaled in disciplinary worth, and that the literature of Greece and Rome contains incomparable models of style. Hence, the study of Latin and Greek gives strength to the faculties and cultivation to the taste. It is further claimed that the study of Latin and Greek possesses great practical worth, inasmuch as it furnishes a valuable acquaintance with English etymology and general grammar, leads to a

vast storehouse of knowledge, and gives a better understanding of the present, which has its roots in the past. The humanists are unsympathetic with the present, they depreciate the science, literature, and culture of modern times, and scarcely allow to Christian civilization any superiority over that of paganism in literary productions."

Then came the modern period. In this period the claims of the modern languages, English, French and German, came forward. Also the natural sciences, chemistry, biology and botany, on account of their vast growth and development, claimed to have value for educational purposes. The mathematics were always one of the established and recognized courses as given in arithmetic and geometry. But in later times analytical mathematics, as contained in trigonometry, analytical geometry and the calculus, were discovered and consequently soon introduced as courses of study. Also the most thoroughly scientific course of the mathematics applied to natural phenomena, as it is presented in our courses of physics, or natural philosophy, took a prominent place as a course most fundamental and profound. This latter course is no doubt of the very highest educational value because it is exact, and combines the theoretical and the experimental sides in such a well-balanced form that quite apart from its practical value, it has undoubtedly a very high value in the training of the mind to an orderly and a correct way of handling its contents.

Social science in all its forms also claims a place in our educational system.

These many branches all put forward their claims; and, we must admit, every one on an inherent merit of its own has to be recognized. Therefore the ancients have to be displaced because undoubtedly all that is worth preserving of them has been absorbed in the modern. The courses in our colleges and universities must therefore, we will not say be modified, but positively be reconstructed to embrace all that has been developed, not as an intrusion into the old but as a positive step of progress and actual development in learning.

In view of this and in view of the great amount of the educational material brought forward, either group systems or elective systems were developed; because it was found that after all the material was too great in amount to be put into a single course. In view of this the following definition of a college course was adopted, whether this course is given in a smaller institution called a college or what is usually called the academic department in a university. That is, Yale College in Yale University, or Harvard College in Harvard University, or all of Franklin and Marshall College.

The definition of a college course as adopted by the Committee of Standards of American Universities to meet the present day requirements is as follows:

"Your Committee believes that there are certain clearly marked tendencies or forces at work in our American society toward a development, at no distant date, of a typical institution of learning, which we may not improperly call the Standard American University.

"This institution will for an indefinite time include as an important part of its organization what we may call a Standard American College, with a four-year curriculum, with a tendency to differentiate its parts in such a way that the first two years shall be looked upon as a continuation of, and a supplement to, the work of secondary instruction, as given in the High School, while the last two years shall be shaped more and more distinctly in the direction of special advanced or university instruction, rising gradually into the advanced work of the graduate schools."

Then this report goes on to define courses distinctly and only university courses with which we are not now concerned. The above, however, gives a clear definition of what a college or rather college university, for there is no longer any course in the old college sense, is and how it makes room for election of branches or courses or groups; so that the material brought forward by modern advances in science and literature, may be applied in educational work in the most suitable and most efficient manner.



It is observed that the course defined here is considerable of an advance on what was considered, say fifty years ago, a college course. It contemplates more mature minds in its students than the older ideas of a college course.

Along with all this material for the intellectual development of the man a peculiar cry has gone out for a development of the whole man, whatever that may mean. Also a peculiar theory of culture of the mind has been developed. Further than this it is rashly assumed that the man, the student, who follows, that is labors with a view to mastering the educational material of this course, only gets intellectual training and no moral training out of the college course.

The theory that the college course is only to cultivate the mind, or for mental culture, and that all that is learned at college, if ever anything is learned at college, by a combination of a teacher and pupil who are thoroughly imbued with this idea, has, we believe, produced a kind of meaningless following of a course which produces practically no results either for mental culture or for the acquisition of knowledge. The not infrequent statement that all that is learned at college is to be forgotten and of no use, has done no end of harm to the encouragement of thorough work on the part of students and teachers. A cultivated mind is a mind that is so developed that it has undoubtedly its powers enlarged; but, and this is no less important, it must also be stored with the fundamental theories and facts of science and literature. It never is cultivated unless it has a content of material upon which and with which it can operate. That the college course is so purely a culture course that nothing is to be retained, and that all that was acquired is to be of no account, leads to the hasty conclusion in many instances, that, therefore after all, it does not matter much whether students work or do not work, acquire something or do not acquire anything; that somehow being at college gives them mental culture—and of course, a diploma for the same.

It would also follow that this sort of thing is probably purely an intellectual effect and of no moral value.

In the book on *Individual Training in our Colleges* by Clarence F. Birdseye, we read the following on this subject of pure culture work:

"We are trying to get figs from thistles when we expect to do much in culture courses to-day. The general college atmosphere is not a 'culture' atmosphere. It is more apt to be for laziness and shirking, and athletic, social and fraternity distractions. Nor is it an atmosphere that is likely to make a young man seek culture in after years. As shown elsewhere, a college 'culture' course is a comparatively recent educational fad, not thought of in the semi-professional courses of our earlier colleges, and which would have been scoffed at by our forefathers. . . . In too many cases 'culture' courses are the lazy man's courses at college." Again, "No amount of college 'culture' can by itself act as a substitute for that true mental and moral training that will produce a strong, clean problem solver."

We are aware that no less a distinguished educator than President Hadley, whose words are heard and received in the great educational councils of the world where ours never will be heard, has said:

"The ideal college education is one where a student learns things that he is not going to use in after life by methods he is going to use." If the student does not get things that he ought to retain and must retain in order to be a cultivated man and a man of service to his fellowmen then our job as college educators is virtually gone. The methods saved for use may be a partial salvation, but why not also have material, intellectual material and moral contents that may be used in after life. For in the very statement there is involved the idea that there is material to be used in after life but not that obtained in college. This is a dangerous proposition which will detract from the seriousness of the college work both for student and professor; since there can be no serious interest in useless things and for many loafing, therefore, is quite as good as work.

For our comfort, if not for yours, we will quote Professor Gayley of Ann Arbor, we believe, on this subject. He says:

"The ideal college education is precisely not what President Hadley says it is, but what you see he might have said: It is where a student learns things and methods that he is going to use in after life; but not the things and methods that he is going to use for one use only. The latter learning is of the professional school."

To make our point clear perhaps we can do no better than quote a remark of Professor E. H. Hall, of Harvard University, made at the last Boston meeting of the American Physical Society. After a certain well known physicist made the remark that for elementary students in physics we must remember that after all the principal thing and the principal object in physics teaching was merely mental culture after the good old style, Professor Hall ventured the following remark.

"Teach your students a thorough course in physics and the mental culture will take care of itself without preaching much about it."

The indifference to a maintenance of proper standards of requirement of scholarship in our colleges and for admission to college, is no doubt responsible for the indifference of students to their work. This indifference is no doubt greater in general courses than in the technical and the professional courses. So that in this way much of the disciplinary value of general courses is lost both in the line of intellectual training and scholarship, as well as in the way of moral training and moral worth which latter should be brought about by the faithful performance of the work assigned in the regular college course. Along with this pure mental culture view, which has undoubtedly contributed much to the inefficiency of regular college work, comes another which fallaciously assumes that the college work is purely intellectual and overlooks the fact that the doing of regular college work the same as doing any other work, is also a moral training. So the cry has gone forward that the college must make men, not so much educated

men, as somehow men. Never mind your English literature, mathematics, your physics or sociology or your biology or your Latin or your Greek even, and all the other work that a college has to offer, but make men. The next step in this line is no matter how many fail to make even a passable standing, still by the grace of the faculty and by easy substitutes, make men.

We believe entirely in the fact that colleges and universities ought to make men; but we as little believe in the methods usually proposed by these makers of men in college. The difficulty with these cries, these wonderfully new and high-sounding terms, is that when you come to analyze them they always come to a substitution of some outside affair, some grandstand performance of little real moment which is to make men and put aside what is the regular business and work of the college as if this latter did not make men. We are here to emphasize the fact that positively it is the regular college work, as set down in the schedule of recitations, that does make men. The college work does give intellectual training, we hope, as a matter of course; and further it must be remembered that thorough intellectual training, power to do correct thinking and the accumulation of the proper kind of knowledge, is very close to correct action, in fact, leads to right moral action. In addition to this the doing of intellectual work, a high order of work, above any physical work certainly, produces the highest moral training in the doing of the work, which develops character as much as character can be developed at school. It does this in a way that is immensely superior to any of the fads that are supposed to do this developing of morals; but which really have been magnified out of all proportion to their importance, as compared with what the regular work done honestly and faithfully can do in the way of developing moral character, growing distinctly out of the regular college work.

Continued regular work is not nearly so dazzling, nor nearly so pleasing to the untried and untrained as are the usual stunts introduced to bring up what is called the moral train-

ing, but which in reality is at best very indifferent if not directly immoral in its final tendencies. Along with this making of men has come the frivolous fad of bodily culture in the way of intercollegiate athletics. This is to be the stimulant for getting to work on developing the human body directly and then the later discovery seems to have been made that this sort of thing is to be the moral development of the student which the regular college work, it seems, is supposed not to do.

Now in the first place there is probably nothing that can be found in student life that is of more positive harm to the health and normal bodily development of the student than intercollegiate athletics, foot-ball with reformed code put in at its full value. That the student, much the same as other people, ought to take a reasonable amount of rather mild form of exercise with good air or in the open air, is only saying what may be said of anybody else and is all that needs to be said for the student body as well as for other people; for the student is no more confined than are the majority of people who are not directly engaged in outdoor manual labor. If what is now provided in our formal gymnasium work is not sufficient, quite enough could be provided if the enormous amount of time given to preparation for contests of all kinds, and the usual run of grandstand acts was used in legitimate and healthy mild exercises, suitable for the normal development of the body of the character that is needed by the student's body. The body does not need so much strength as good healthy free action which comes from a kind of exercise very different from that brought about by athletic contests or preparations for the same.

No doubt a good part of the cry for the physical development of the body came from some serious misapprehensions of fact concerning American life. It was hastily assumed that the American race or life was fast degenerating physically, was immensely inferior to the foreigner, particularly to the English with their sports; and that therefore as generally understood

the Johnny Bull idea of manhood would have to be introduced into America and particularly to the American college or university in order to make the American physically strong.

Let us see what Dr. Woods Hutchinson says, who has a large experience in investigating these matters, both at home and abroad. In an address given by the doctor at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, we read the following:

"The unanimous opinion of all foreign and most native observers is that the American race is degenerating, becoming lank, nervous, dyspeptic, hysterical, frivolous and immoral, the only disagreement being the degree of said degeneracy and the causes which have produced it.

"The most favorite causes are: Too much rich food, bolting our meals, fried things, wasting saliva on the sidewalks instead of saving it for our digestion, liberty run to license. The first line up which stamped us with the brand of physical inferiority was in the days of the civil war, and here in the enlistment records the full measure of our physical degeneracy was revealed.

"Almost every country in Europe and every degree of Americanization from the German forty-niner to the descendants of the three brothers who came over in the Mayflower, was represented; not merely in scores, but in hundreds and thousands. When the war was over some rash person set out to make a comparative study of these measurements, with the mortifying result of finding that the race had become so abnormally elongated in the process of decay that the native-born Americans of all sorts were nearly an inch and three quarters longer than the soldiers of English, Irish, Dutch, French and German birth and that those recruits who had been longest in America and at the same time least mixed with any recent importations or streams of immigration, the Kentuckians, Indianians and Kansans, were nearly two inches taller than the soldiers of any of these European nationalities.

"This of course, was simply due to the proverbial lankiness

of the Yankees. We turned to the next item of chest measurement in fear and trembling, only to find however, that, due probably to our well-known fondness for oratory, our lungs had actually expanded to a circumference of nearly an inch greater than that of the average European-born recruits.

"Nearly every comparison had a provoking trick with almost an identical or even lower death rate and disease rate in the American column, except for our great cities, but of recent years these have ranged up alongside of the European figures. This of course, was easily explained by the imperfectness of our records and the fact that many cases of death and disease were not recorded. But for the last twenty-five years our sanitary organization has advanced by leaps and bounds, until we now have areas which are almost as perfectly reported and recorded as any in Europe, and whose figures may be relied upon for purposes of comparison; and the net result may be summed up by saying that at practically no age, class, or social condition is the death rate in the United States more than one or two points per thousand higher than in the corresponding class in any of the European countries, and in the large majority of them, especially in the infancy and childhood, it is markedly lower. Some of the western cities and states have the lowest death rates recorded anywhere in the civilized world.

"One thing, however, we have felt absolutely sure of, and that was that we do not here in America live as long as they used to in the good old days on the other side of the Atlantic. We might be bigger and healthier than our ancestors and contemporaries in Europe, but we certainly die earlier, probably by going to pieces all at once like the 'One-hoss Shay.' The first thing that reassured us was that our insurance companies were still doing business, not only at the same old stands, but at the same old rates as European companies, and didn't appear to be losing money either."

Since these statistics nearly all come before and outside of the line of intercollegiate athletics we doubt very much the



need and value of these performances with all their published claims of results.

In order to bring out a few more points on this line let us look into the results of modern athletics a little closer.

"Dr. Roebert Coughlin has made some investigations upon the causes of the deaths among athletes for the year 1905."

It appears that 128 athletes died as of record for that year. Seventy-eight died from injuries and 50 from disease.

"Passing by accidents Dr. Coughlin compared the death rate of policyholders in one of the large life insurance companies of about the same age and grade with the death rates of athletes." He finds: "That the death rates from infectious diseases among these picked specimens, these prides of their clubs and colleges, was nearly double that of the other adult males of the community."

Again Dr. Coughlin finds that taking up a list of champion college athletes for fifty years to the number of 761 prepared, we understand, in defence of athletics; that of this number the actual age at death of this series was only 26.2 years, as against an average of 57.2 years in all persons dying after fifteen years of age, according to the last United States Census. The champion athlete is a low standard to aim at. "This," says Dr. Hutchinson, "is clearly recognized and eagerly urged by intelligent, scientific, gymnasium trainers, like Sargent of Harvard, Seaver of Yale, and Gulich of New York, but the heaven has reached but little of the mass of undergraduates and members of athletic clubs as yet."

Dr. James Tyson, professor of medicine in the University of Pennsylvania, in a commencement address at Haverford College, makes the following observations:

"Essential to the fulfillment of the conditions mentioned is a sound mind in a sound body—in other words good health of the student. But athletic games do not tend especially to produce symmetrical physical development. We physicians are often consulted in after years for the jaded heart whose failure is ascribed by its owner to the strain of the rowing

match, and the repeated struggle of the foot-ball game. As soon as athletic games become dangerous to life, as soon as they crush the spirit of human sympathy or kindness or develop a surliness which smothers a cheer at a rival's success or become instruments of college advertisement, a magnet to attract students, then they become an excrescence on the college life which should be excised at the root." So much for the merely physical training which is by the way.

It is a rather strange anomaly that those people, who are not satisfied with the moral training that goes along with the work of a college or university, which is as much like most of the work in after life as such things can be, of course excluding those that work with the pick and shovel, should try to find the desired moral training in pitting a lot of young men against one another in an open field. The combat and the struggle is quite akin to that in which a lot of oxen would engage under similar conditions, and, strange to say, physical training of a proper kind is supposed to be developed, and over and above this a quite superior moral training is even claimed for the contestants.

Further, the conditions are not a whit better in the field sports as a certain class of contests are denominated. These exercises put undue strain on the system of men, often of young men that are ill prepared to take such strain and above all there is no occasion for the unreasonable physical competition that is practiced in these exercises. These violent contests often result in an enlargement of the heart and other functions of the body which, after the over exertion is at an end, ought to go back to their normal form but, as a matter of fact, do not do so. Also the moral atmosphere and training is no better than that brought about in any of the general athletic contests.

Dr. Edward Curtis, of Columbia University, in his book *Nature and Health* says:

"But right here comes up a point that is very commonly misunderstood. Exercise develops muscles, it is true, but such

development is a consequence, not the aim, of the exercise. Except in a few strenuous occupations, such as baggage smashing or prize fighting, a big biceps is no special use, and may, indeed, be a nuisance by interfering with the proper movements of the arm. Unhappy Hercules, that cannot reach to brush a spider from the back of his neck! No, the purpose of exercise is the quickening of the vital activities through muscular play, in both senses of the word, and not the mere building of muscle-mass through muscular work."

Further on the same author says: "And for special exercising of breathing and of the abdominal muscles certain movements without the use of apparatus are especially fit."

No doubt the sudden discovery of this immensely overestimated value as a moral training of athletic sports and the usual so-called student interests, has at least a partial explanation in the history of education. This matter has no doubt been helped along as a result of the conflict between the so-called humanistic age and later age of natural science and modern literature. Probably the feelings of those who are strong advocates of the ancient pagan languages and literatures as the only things fit to present to modern young men of Christian nations for purposes of culture and refinement, would also feel that Greek athletics should be handed down to present day students; although there is no evidence that Greek athletics and Greek student life had any relation whatever. If not this then at least English athletics, as developed in the two older aristocratic universities of Cambridge and Oxford, must be introduced. At any rate a conflict between the old and the new went on and usually as the older forms are overcome and displaced by the new the old prefers anything but the new, however puerile its choice may be. Therefore no science or as little as possible because that gives only, and purely and merely an intellectual development which is of low order greatly undervalued and the case of modern languages and literature is not much better. Hence the doing of that intellectual work is undervalued as work, the faithful and honest

doing of which is of moral value far above that growing out of any bodily contests. This trying to get moral development out of physical contests reminds us of Macaulay who says: "There is no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodical fits of morality"; to which another writer adds, "but Macaulay never saw the United States of America engaged in a death grapple with a prize fight."

Moral training in only the crudest form, if at all, can come from these things because moral training comes from the serious things of life and not from play and sport. These things have some value, it is said, in development of child life, but according to the definition of the college course or the college university course, quoted at the beginning, we are in a period of life when childish things are to be laid aside and the serious business of life is to be seriously taken up; and this lies entirely in the regular work of a college or university. The intellectual and the moral training are in doing the intellectual work fairly and honestly; just as in the business relations of life also largely intellectual or in any other social relations, the doing of duties imposed develops the moral character of men and women.

In order that a person may get moral training out of life he must be engaged in some serious pursuit of work which is being attended to in an orderly and sincere manner; and not by erratic fits and starts which is the character of the methods of the indolent and those who are wanting in moral training, in fact in those who have not yet or never will develop any character. Jules Payot in his *Education of the Will* says:

"Fundamental laziness in no way hinders periodic instances of energy. Uncivilized people are by no means averse to occasional outbursts of energy. What is so distasteful to them is that regulated persistent labor which in the end amounts to a very superior degree of energy. Any regular expenditure of energy, even though it be slight, accomplishes more than great efforts separated by long rests. Idlers can readily endure war, which demands momentary violent efforts, followed

by long periods of inactivity. The Arabs conquered a vast empire but they did not hold it, because they were not able to keep up the continued effort of organizing and administering the country such as making roads and founding schools and industries. . . ." Again: "It is so true that moderate, but continued, effort alone expresses real and fruitful energy that we may consider all work deviating from this type as lazy work."

Here is precisely the difficulty with our college work. We are continually engaged in what Professor Gayley calls "idols" and as he is a Greek scholar, well able to give a catalogue of idols akin to Homer's catalogue of ships, we will quote his catalogue of college activities which are presumed by some to be of great moral value.

"Class meetings, business meetings, committee meetings, editorial meetings, foot-ball rallies, base-ball rallies, pajama rallies, vicarious athletics on the bleachers, garrulous athletics in dining room and parlor and on the porch, rehearsals of the glee club, rehearsals of the mandolin club and of the banjo, rehearsals for dramatics (a word to stand the hair on end), college dances and class banquets, fraternity dances and suppers, preparations for the dances and banquets, more committees for the preparations; a running up and down the campus for ephemeral items for ephemeral articles in ephemeral papers, a soliciting of advertisements" and so on for one full page more with this conclusion: "What margin of leisure is left for the one activity of the college, which is study?"

These things are clearly not the things that have either intellectual or moral value. Some few, under considerable limitations and control, might be said to have some slight social and moral value. A large part of them at the very best and most charitable estimate are of absolutely no value when compared with regular work; but these things do more than simply kill time in a pleasant way in that they destroy the process of forming regular and well-developed character for prolonged and serious work; and so far they are immoral. Many

of them are distinctly immoral in their own tendencies because they imbue as a matter of neglected opportunities for real work, a cramming and a "get-rich-quick" spirit and a spirit of playing for stakes which lead directly in the way that led a Morse or a Walsh to the penitentiary.

It would be a strange anomaly and would be ridiculed as a business blunder, if it were not considered insanely absurd, for the Saratoga Racing Association to advertise with a college or university course of studies and attempt to draw a crowd to the races. Is it any more absurd for a college to use the above list of affairs and functions and thereby attempt to attract students for the one really valuable activity of college or university life, its regular curriculum?

Right here let me say is the point where the college or university is not in good standing with the public—*its patrons*. The college that attends to its real business is not under fire or even very much under criticism. The present undergraduate course, as given by the university association quoted at the beginning, is pretty well accepted as standard. To be sure modifications will be made from time to time, but in the main features it is standard and may easily be modified by electives to a more literary, a more purely scientific, or a more technical line, especially and designedly so in the junior and senior years. This is quite well understood and accepted; and that college or university which keeps up its standard of scholarship need fear nothing from the outside. In fact parents and guardians are looking for precisely that college or university which will bring about such a state of affairs that the serious things of its course are mastered and attended to; and that the student's mind is developed and filled, at least comfortably filled, with such knowledge which makes for complete living and as well for complete service in after life; in whatever field the young man will enter in still farther working out his problem of life for himself and in filling out his place in society through his profession, whether he be lawyer, doctor, clergyman or engineer or for that matter in general a

captain of industry. The world only finds fault when it appears that the frivolous things are magnified and forever put forward. Then comes the question so seriously asked in the *Outlook* several years ago, where shall I send my son to college or university for college work?

No doubt the college is not simply to make men for service intellectually, but as well morally; and so we claim it does, as far as school life can prepare for service when it attends to that which is its business. The practical is not always quite what is expected of it, perhaps. This problem is closely related to the complaint made even against technical courses in the way of intellectual training. There are always some who may think technical courses should be even more intensely technical or practical. There also are some who do not think so; who indeed maintain that technical courses should be more liberal, especially in the two first years of a four- or five-year course. But it is generally accepted that in first-class universities these matters are fairly well balanced and give about all that can be given in a school course and that the rest must be acquired in later service. So with the moral development of students; it becomes quite satisfactory when the students attend to their duties faithfully and regularly, expending a constant and uniform amount of energy on their assigned work. This is what makes substantial character for the doing of this work is character-building as well as intellectual development. Faithful service is always in the line of character-building, and there is ample scope for all that a young man can do in this direction in doing the appointed work with precision, with an honest purpose and in a thorough manner. This is all a man needs to do in his life-work and in his relation to his fellow men. He is not to try out his strength to do up other people either physically or in his business relations, as a captain of industry or as a professional man. But in his social relation he is to be considerate of others, altruistic. Gains are to be mutual gains; not as was formerly supposed that gains can only be made by the losses of others. All of



which is not after the manner of contests and sports which bring results only of gains and losses, winning and defeating none of which are moral, and distinctly non-Christian. In fact, they are a relic of the barbarism of the pre-scientific ages.

Education is to be for service to fellowmen, and the value of an education intellectually and morally is to be such as will best prepare for that service. Dr. Eliot, the venerable ex-president of Harvard, in an after dinner address at the inauguration of Dr. Nichols as president of Dartmouth College, said: "I do not agree at all, gentlemen, with the proposition that we have got to the right motive, whether in foot-ball or in scholarship, when we induce young men to act for the honor of their college. That is better than seeking personal glory, but that is not the true motive in any man's intellectual and spiritual life. The true motive burns in American youth, the American educated youth of to-day and for the last fifty years it has burned hotly. The true motive is service, service to society, to the community into which man is thrown, service to the nation, service to mankind."

Therefore the true moral development of a man can only come by a consistent application to a serious line of work. This for a young man at college or university is to do that which is set down for him to do in the regular course. To do this involves serious hardships because any one not yet trained in industry will be irritated and annoyed by being obliged to work. It therefore requires a development of will power for the individual to so master himself in order that he be able to control himself in the application of a fixed and regular amount of energy to his line of work. That this is correct is amply illustrated by the attitude of a class of industrious workers as compared with a class of indolent ones. Indolence, carelessness and bad conduct are almost in every case characteristics of the same individual as also are industry, honest purpose and good conduct.

Serious work begins with intelligent training and ends in moral development by the application of energy to do efficient

intellectual work. For instance, a class in moral philosophy develops character, if it is so conducted that the members of the class must do work in mastering the subject; and not by the precepts it teaches, although these may help. In practice, therefore, less lecturing and more thorough recitation work; so as to put men to work to master the science, the material of the science, in order that they become imbued with it. Then it is not mere intellectual truth; but it becomes a part of the practical as well as the intellectual side of man; that is, the will is trained to the good and character is formed.

"First it is an almost absolute rule in psychology" says Payot in his *The Education of the Will*, "that every idea of an action to be accomplished, or to be shunned, if it is very distinct, has, in the absence of hostile affective states, a power of realization which is explained by the fact that there is no great essential difference between the idea and its action. When an action is conceived, it is already begun. The pre-imagining of an action is like its frequent repetition in that it produces a semi-tension which precedes the final tension in such a way that the pre-conceived action is rapidly executed."

Again we read: "In short the brave man is not he who performs some great act of courage, but rather he who courageously performs all the acts of life. That student who, in spite of his disinclination, makes himself get up and look up a word in the dictionary, who finishes his work in spite of his desire to loaf a little, who reads to the end of a difficult page—he is the man of courage. It is by these thousand apparently insignificant actions that the will is strengthened, and all work begins to bear fruit."

This is not a cold and lifeless morality, lacking in sentiment. Sentiment is a most deceptive thing; so is enthusiasm. The shouting for the colors or for the team is of very doubtful value as an index either of loyalty, courage or character. No doubt enthusiasm is necessary if it is enthusiasm for some serious purpose, and this is a more real enthusiasm than the shouting kind.

Dr. Münsterberg in his *Psychology and the Teacher* says: "A great man has said that enthusiasm is the best fruit which we gain from the study of history, but surely the pupil's study of history is only one of the many factors which must co-operate in filling the young mind with enthusiasm for progress, and reform, and industrial growth, and self-development and the highest possible service to mankind."

This application of energy must be so continuous and so strenuous that it will take place somewhat at the expense of the physical, otherwise the discipline is not of a character to bring the desired result. Vacation time, about thirty per cent. of the year, will be quite time enough for a re-balancing of the bodily wear with the intellectual and moral surplus; if there is anything outstanding that needs to be balanced. No doubt there is a time appointed for work and a time for recreation in vacation time; because this separation is the only way that there can be a serious continued application during the sessions of our colleges and universities. There must be a continuous application of energy and not an erratic and fitful one interrupted by sports. The application must be made with fairness and honesty of purpose and here is the scope for high moral purposes. When this is systematically done then, and then only, is character properly formed. All these things are done by the faithful students and are not done by the frivolous ones who are the victims of the "high-finance" in college work. Faithful students develop moral strength from their work as students. They develop character of a kind that fits them for the highest positions in the world's work, and they are the exponents of the moral value of college work.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE,  
LANCASTER, PA.

## II.

### DID PAUL UNDERSTAND JESUS?<sup>1</sup>

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul twice speaks of "my gospel." The expression suggests the thought that Paul's interpretation of Jesus was peculiar. He was one of the first interpreters of the Master and his interpretation has exercised a powerful influence on the history of Christian thought. It has been differentiated from other interpretations, as for example that of Peter; and there is no doubt of the fact that there is a difference. Immediately after his conversion, Paul retired to Arabia; and however much room we may feel disposed to make for subsequent development in his system of thought, there can be no question that, so far as the main outline of his system is concerned, he had thought that out for himself, before he had his first interview with those who were apostles before him. He had his own peculiar interpretation of Jesus and his gospel by the time he returned to Damascus. On this he has himself laid emphasis in Galatians 1: 11-17.

One of the peculiar notes of Paul's gospel is that of universality. With his conversion there came to him the distinct call to preach the gospel to the Gentiles (Gal. 2: 16); and he at once perceived that all men are freely justified by God's

<sup>1</sup> The discussion on the relation between Jesus and Paul, referred to in this article, was precipitated by the appearance of Wrede's *Paulus*. It belongs to the *Religionsgeschichtliche-volksbücher*. A translation of it was published by the American Unitarian Association of Boston. Contributions to the discussion have been made by others, as follows: Kaftan, *Jesus und Paulus*; Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus*; Meyer, *Wer hat das Christenthum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus?* Johann Weiss, *Paulus und Jesus*; Kölbing, *The Spiritual Influence of the Man Jesus upon Paul*; McGiffert, *Was Jesus or Paul the Founder of Christianity?* Meyer and Weiss are published in translation in Harper's Library of Living Thought.

grace "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3: 24). He seems, moreover, from the very beginning to have exercised his ministry along the lines which were thus revealed to him in his solitude. Though he essayed to preach at Damascus and in Jerusalem, his work in both places was cut short and it was only in the regions of Syria and Cilicia that he was first permitted to make converts for the Master on the basis of his conception of the gospel. Of course, we know very little of his work during those ten years at Tarsus and in the regions round about; yet we can feel sure that his preaching was along the line of his subsequent missionary activity. He preached what he calls "my gospel"; and that it was with some measure of success may be inferred from the fact that, when Barnabas came down to Antioch to see the work of the Lord which was being done there, he immediately set out for to seek Saul.

However, it was not until the successes which crowned the labors of his first missionary journey that the peculiarity of Paul's interpretation of Jesus and his gospel attracted attention. It then became the subject of a sharp controversy, which for awhile threatened to disrupt the church. He was persistently followed by those whose interpretation of the gospel differed from his own; and the bitterest trials of his life came to him through the machinations of those Judaizers who followed his footsteps through Galatia, Asia and as far as Corinth. They accused him of preaching, not the pure gospel of Jesus, as that had been handed down by those who had heard him, but a gospel which he had thought out for himself, and for which he had no higher authority than his own reason.

Paul, however, triumphed over his enemies. As at the council at Jerusalem, so throughout the entire period of the later Apostolic Church, his view prevailed. This is now generally conceded. Interpreters of the New Testament are agreed in the view that the Pauline interpretation of the gospel prevails in the First Epistle of Peter and in the Fourth Gospel. Many have gone much further; and some of our

later commentators are busy pointing out the Paulinisms in Mark and Luke. In fact, nearly the whole of the New Testament is held by many to have been written under the Pauline influence; so that, if one would understand its various books one must understand the Pauline system of thought.

And yet there has been many a period of reaction since that day. What has been called Paulinism in the narrower sense, his view of man, sin, and redemption, especially his doctrine of predestination, has been combated again and again; and it has been allowed more frequently to fall quietly into the background, as during the semi-Pelagian reaction, and during the period preceding the Reformation. And yet this stricter Paulinism has reasserted itself again and again, so that it is probably true that even in this sense the Pauline interpretation of Jesus has been more influential in moulding the life and the thought of the Christian centuries than any other.

More than this may be said. We have not measured the influence of Paul, when we have traced the difference between him and Peter, for example, and have pointed out how the Pauline interpretation has triumphed over the Petrine. The question has been raised to what extent that portion of the Christian interpretation of Jesus, which has been accepted by the entire church, by Peter and the rest of the apostles and the New Testament writers as well as by Paul, must be traced to his influence. In the history of Christian thought, the agreements have been far greater than the disagreements. So far as the great fundamentals of the Christian faith are concerned, Roman Catholics and Protestants of all denominations have been of substantially the same mind. So far as the church's conception of the person of Christ and of his work of redemption is concerned, there has been substantial agreement. "The entire system of Christianity hangs together, and fundamental to it is the conviction of man's essential depravity and his inability to escape of himself the impending destruction." So says Professor A. C. McGiffert in the *American Journal of Theology*;<sup>2</sup> and he adds, "This system the Reformers retained

<sup>2</sup> January, 1909, p. 15.

and handed down to Protestant Christendom. Changed here and there in its details, particularly in the doctrine of the church and the sacraments, in its essential features, it remained unaltered, and only modern liberalism has really broken with it. A perusal of any of the great Protestant symbols, such as the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession, will make this abundantly manifest. The orthodox Christian system, both Catholic and Protestant, both ancient and modern, is as has been indicated. Principles, beliefs, and practices are essentially one, in spite of all divisions and differences. Historic Christianity has a definite content which it is not difficult to discover and describe. Where then did it come from? Was Jesus its author, or was Paul? Or is it the fruit of long centuries of development, a system of much later growth than either Jesus or Paul? As a matter of fact it can be traced back in all its essential features to the second century of our era. . . . And not simply can the historic Christian system in all its essential content be traced back to the second century; it can all be found in Paul."

But if this is true, as we believe it is, the question comes back to what extent is Paul responsible for it? Did he get it from Jesus? Or is it a scheme of thought which he has wrought out for himself? Usually it has been taken for granted that Paul is in agreement with Jesus, and that the Pauline interpretation taken in this wider sense, is in harmony with the teaching of our Lord. But as Professor McGiffert says, modern liberalism has challenged this view. It denies that Paul is in harmony with Jesus; and it has substantially returned to the position of Paul's Judaizing enemies in at least one important respect. It denies that what Paul calls "my gospel" is really the gospel at all; and it affirms that, in its most characteristic features, the interpretation of the person of Jesus and of his work of redemption, his system is a man-made scheme, based not on the testimony of Jesus, nor on any direct revelation, but on contemporary Jewish thought, and on his own reason.



The importance of this challenge of modern liberalism will be readily seen. It challenges the correctness of the very foundations of the Christian faith, as that has been held with substantial unanimity from the day of Paul down to our own time; and it has laid upon the church the necessity of studying anew the foundations on which the Pauline system of thought rests.

What are the grounds on which this challenge rests? And what is it that modern liberalism proposes to substitute for the age-long faith of the church?

The challenge rests mainly on two grounds: the alleged discrepancy between the conception of Paul and the teaching of Jesus, as that is given in the Synoptic Gospels; and the alleged violence which Paul's thought does to the modern view of the world.

The former of these grounds is thus stated by Professor McGiffert, in the article above referred to: "One thing is clear. Between Paul and the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel the connection is very close. Many of the essential features of Paul's system reappear in that Gospel: the necessity of regeneration changing a man from a fleshly to a spiritual being (John 3), union with Christ (chap. 15), the deity of Christ (chap. 1 and often), the sacramental view of baptism and the Lord's Supper (chap. 3 and 6)—all these are found in the teaching of the Johannine Christ. But all the more striking by contrast is the lack of all these elements in the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Of the essentially fleshly and evil nature of man nothing is said; nothing of the consequent need of regeneration; nothing of mystical union with Christ, and nothing of his deity; and no trace of sacramentalism appears in connection with baptism and the Lord's Supper. It is not merely a difference of emphasis or form of statement. There is wanting altogether in the Synoptic Gospels the great and consistent body of teaching, which is not merely present, but fundamental and controlling in the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John. When this is once

recognized it must be clear that that body of teaching came from some other source than Jesus himself and the conclusion can hardly be resisted that it came from Paul, in whose writings it is first found, and whose own experience fully accounts for its origin. The despair into which he had fallen as a result of his total inability to keep the law of God, as he felt that it ought to be kept, a despair shared by no other Christian of the day, so far as we know, the revelation of Christ as a spiritual being freed from evil flesh, a revelation whose tremendous and revolutionary influence can be matched nowhere else in the first century; his contacts with hellenistic life and thought, making the dualistic explanation of human corruption more natural to him than to Jesus and his primitive disciples; the cataclysmic character of his conversion, rendering a cataclysmic interpretation of Christian experience and the Christian life almost inevitable to him—all this makes it easy to explain the remarkable conception of Christianity which appears first in his epistles and which can be accounted for in no other way.”<sup>3</sup>

The import of all this can hardly be mistaken. Professor McGiffert finds such a difference between the conception of Paul and the teaching of Jesus on all the great essentials of the Pauline system that he does not hesitate to affirm that it is the product of the Apostle's own experience and thought.

And the conclusion to which all this leads is apparent. The entire Pauline view is discredited. The doctrine of the deity of our Lord, of human depravity, of the redemptive work of Jesus—all become untenable. Wrede traces the Pauline conception of the divinity of Jesus to the Apostle's pre-Christian conception of the Messiah. He says, “Paul believed in such a celestial being, in a divine Christ, before he believed in Jesus. Until he became a Christian it seemed to him sacrilege to call Jesus the Christ. This man did not answer at all to the divine figure of Christ which Paul bore within him. But in the moment of conversion, when Jesus appeared before him

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 17, 18.

in the shining glory of his existence, Paul identified him with his own Christ, and straightway transferred to Jesus all the conceptions which he already had of the celestial being—for instance, that he had existed before the world and had taken part in its creation. The man Jesus was really, therefore, only the wearer of all those mighty predicates which had already been established; but the bliss of the apostle lay in this, that he could now regard what had hitherto been a mere hope, as a tangible reality which had come into the world.”<sup>4</sup> And with this account of the origin of the Pauline conception of the divinity of our Lord agrees what Wrede has to give as his final estimate of the doctrine. “If we are to designate the character of this conception we cannot avoid the word ‘myth.’ We do not employ it with the desire to hurt any one’s feelings. It is not, as we use it, an expression of contempt. A doctrine whose profundity has endowed millions of hearts with the best of their possessions, a doctrine without which such men as Luther, Paul Gerhard and Johann Sebastian Bach could not have been, a doctrine which even to-day comforts and fills with peace thousands of good earnest people, a doctrine which has given the thoughts of divine love and grace and of human sinfulness their most powerful expression, such a doctrine we treat with reverence. But the nature of the thought that a divine being forsakes heaven, veils himself in humanity and then dies, in order to ascend again into heaven, is not altered by such considerations as these. To one who cannot give credence to it it is necessarily, in its own essence, a mythological conception.”<sup>5</sup>

This is the first ground on which the challenge of modern liberalism rests, and the conclusion which the most daring of the liberals has deduced from it. We say “the most daring of the liberals” advisedly; for we are well aware that many do not follow him in his extreme conclusions. But the question may well be raised, granted the premises laid down by

<sup>4</sup> *Paul*, p. 151.

<sup>5</sup> *Paul*, p. 179.

Professor McGiffert, does not the conclusion of Wrede follow by logical necessity?

But granting, for the sake of the argument, that the difference between the theology of Paul and the teaching of Jesus is as great and as irreconcilable as Professor McGiffert represents it to be (a concession which, we think, a sound exegesis by no means warrants us in making), is there not another way in which we can justify the Pauline interpretation? Paul claims to have received his gospel by revelation. "For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12). Referring evidently to his experience by the roadside near Damascus, he says, "And last of all, as to the child untimely born, he appeared to me also" (1 Cor. 15:8). And it is to be observed that he uses the same word, *ᾤφθη*, in referring to this appearance that he had just used in referring to the appearances to Cephas and the twelve, implying that he regarded the appearance as of the same character as the appearances of the risen Christ to the disciples after the resurrection. He further explains this appearance as a revelation of Christ "in him" (Gal. 1:16), implying that what he there saw was the Christ in glory, whose nature he learned to apprehend through a revelation from God. Now, did not Paul thus receive an insight into the divine nature of Jesus, which he could not otherwise have had, and which may justify his view?

On this point Dr. Arnold Meyer says: "Again, if St. Paul professes to have received everything by divine revelation, we seem to be excluded from tracing back his doctrine to his own reflection or from regarding it as a product of his own speculation. With justice it can be upheld that it was not Paul that created his Christ, but it was his Christ who seized him, overpowered him, and subdued him—that he came to Paul as One whom Paul would not accept, whom he denied and persecuted; and that here we stand before *the mystery* of religion which mocks at all explanation, which it is the very

essence of religion to acknowledge and to reverence, without which earth would be a desert and heaven blackness, life would be mere hollowness, and all prospect upwards would be closed."<sup>6</sup>

Has not the larger Paulinism of which we are speaking here a safe ground on which to rest? Surely, if Paul was not an utterly self-deceived enthusiast, it would seem so. Yet it is just at this point that the modern liberal view finds its second ground for the challenge with which it has met the Pauline conception of Christianity. It denies the objective reality of the appearance of Jesus on the road side near Damascus. Johann Weiss says, "But modern criticism regards the matter from another standpoint and considers that the experience on the way to Damascus was simply a vision or hallucination. Paul may have regarded it as an experience sent by God, and so, ultimately, may we regard it; but the characteristic point of the modern view is that the divine action turned to account certain psychological conditions which occurred in strictly regular sequence. What Paul saw was not the effect of an impression produced by an object external to his observation; the picture formed upon his retina was evoked by mental excitement, and the several features of the picture were the expression of ideas which had long been harboured by the observer; the consequence of a great mental upheaval was to bring these ideas into a new combination, so that they formed plastic and realistic material for a convincing picture."<sup>7</sup> But it should be added, the picture, thus formed, was formed out of "ideas which had long been harboured by the observer," and can have had no more validity than those ideas themselves. In a similar strain Wrede says, "So much is sure—Jesus cannot have stood in the body before his enemy. Paul's own views and conceptions are also decisive on this point. For Paul knows no resurrection of the flesh. He does indeed ascribe a body to those who have risen, but a

<sup>6</sup> *Jesus or Paul*, pp. 42, 43.

<sup>7</sup> *Paul and Jesus*, pp. 28, 29.

'spiritual,' immaterial body, such a body therefore as the outer senses cannot perceive. If then he believed that he had looked upon the risen Jesus, this cannot have been any 'seeing' in the ordinary, 'carnal' sense, no actual seeing with the eyes. It was a vision, and visions are events that take place within the soul, and are products of the human soul, even though the visionary may have no other thought but that his eye receives pictures, his ear tones, from without."<sup>8</sup> Then he adds in a footnote, "Some theologians speak of 'objective visions,' but that is not a scientific conception."

This view of the "vision," of course, hangs together with that view of the world, which would explain everything on the basis of natural causes, which denies all miracles, and which throws doubt on the very possibility of a risen Christ manifesting himself to his own. Paul's visions were "hallucinations," as Johaan Weiss puts it; and his revelations were merely the result of the psychological working of his own inner consciousness, and can have no more validity than the preconceived ideas out of which they grew. If, as Wrede thinks, he was under the influence of contemporary Jewish conceptions of a heavenly being, whom he had identified with the Messiah, and if these conceptions had been unconsciously working within him, then they furnished the elements of the conception which he formed of Jesus whom he imagined that he had seen; and the conception which he formed of Jesus can have no more validity than those Jewish conceptions concerning the heavenly Messiah out of which it grew. Hence, on this view, Wrede may well use the word "myth" with reference to the entire conception of Jesus, which was thus ultimately based on the experience on the way to Damascus.

What, now, does modern liberalism propose to give us in the place of the Pauline system, with which it has thus broken? The question is a large one; and it cannot yet be fully answered. The Pauline system lies clearly before us in the Apostle's letters, and in the countless confessions, litur-

<sup>8</sup> *Paul*, pp. 7, 8.

gies, hymns, and treatises in which the ablest minds of the church have tried to express his Christology and his Soteriology. Modern liberalism has as yet had no time to formulate, in detail, its conception on these great questions. Before we can tell just what it would give us instead of the Pauline system, we must await a new dogmatic; and before that is possible, the liberal critic must have time to do his work, for he has a tremendous task before him. The New Testament, as it now stands, is almost entirely saturated with the Pauline conception of Christ and of his redemption. Before a complete system of liberal dogmatics can be written, the New Testament must pass under the surgeon's knife; and the alleged Paulinisms must be separated from the rest of the material. Even Mark, the oldest of our Gospels, consisting, as we are told, of reminiscences of Peter's preaching, must submit to the process.

But while a complete answer to our question is not now forthcoming, the main outline of the answer has been sketched. Those portions of the Pauline system which are not found in the teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels will be eliminated. This, according to the representations of Professor McGiffert in the quotation above given, includes the conceptions of the essentially fleshly and evil nature of man, his consequent need of regeneration, the mystical union of the believer with Christ, the deity of Christ, and the sacramental conception of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Just what the positive elements are, which will be included, is not so clear; but we may again say, in a general way, that they will be such only as are found in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. We subjoin a few quotations, illustrative of the drift of the movement in this particular.

Speaking of prayer to Christ and prayer in the name of Christ, Professor McGiffert says, "As to Christ's own attitude in the matter the Lord's Prayer seems sufficient evidence that he had nothing directly to do with either of the practices referred to. In the light of that prayer, and of such passages



as Mark 10:18; Matt. 20:23; 24:36, it is clear that he cannot have thought of himself as an object of divine worship, and it is almost as difficult to suppose that he taught that prayer to God should be offered to God through him and in his name. The conclusion indeed can hardly be avoided that the words of John (14:13, 14; 15:16; 16:23, 24, 26), which Origen quotes as authority for praying in Jesus' name, were not spoken by Jesus. He would have the piety of his disciples voice itself as his own did, not in prayer to himself, but to God his Father and theirs, and not through him or in his name, but in direct and immediate communion of son with father. The words in John are entirely in keeping with the general notion of the evangelist that we become children of God only through Christ the Son of God, that we can approach the Father and commune with him only through the Son, and that it is only on his account that God treats men as sons. But this was certainly not Christ's own belief. All men are children of God according to him and all may approach their heavenly Father in perfect confidence and commune directly with him."<sup>9</sup>

Johann Weiss says: "Primitive Christianity is, in part at least, a religion of Christ; in other words, its central point is close dependence by faith upon the exalted Christ. For centuries this form of religion has been regarded as Christianity proper, and numberless Christians at the present day neither know nor desire any other form of faith. They live in closest spiritual communion with the 'Master,' in prayer to him and in longing to meet him face to face. Another religious tendency, which proceeds simultaneously, is unable to rest content with dependency upon the exalted Christ, and finds full satisfaction in progress from Jesus of Nazareth to the Father. These two forms of religious life exist side by side in our churches, and it is very desirable that they should coexist in mutual toleration, and that the preaching of the gospel should do no violence to either of them. I freely admit that I my-

<sup>9</sup> *The American Journal of Theology*, January, 1909, p. 10.

self, with the majority of modern theologians, prefer the second form, and I hope that it will gradually become predominant in our church."<sup>10</sup> (He is, of course, thinking of the theologians of Germany).

In summing up his discussion Weiss says: "There is a fundamental difference between the religion of Paul and the type of religious life which Jesus originally created: to the apostle Jesus is not merely a mediator, guide and example, but he is the object of religious veneration. Paul certainly utters the cry *Abba* together with Jesus; but he also calls upon the name of Christ."

Of course, these quotations give us very little in the way of a constructive system; they were not written for that purpose. But they illustrate the drift of thought; and they show how differently Jesus is viewed by modern liberalism from the way in which he is viewed by Paul and John and by the historic confessions.

It is not the purpose of the present article to enter on a discussion of any of the points involved in this debate on the relation between Jesus and Paul, much less to attempt a refutation of any of the contentions involved in this challenge of modern liberalism. That would be a task far too great to be undertaken in this way. All that is proposed is to state the main point at issue, to point out the serious character of the challenge which is thus made, and to indicate very briefly a few of the lines on which the defense of Paulinism must, in the judgment of the writer, proceed.

The main point at issue, as has been stated again and again in the works which have appeared during the time the discussion has been under way, is nothing short of this, Who is the founder of Christianity, Jesus or Paul? It is in fact a reopening of the first controversy in the history of the Christian church. Is Paul's gospel the same as the gospel which Jesus preached? Or did Paul preach another gospel, which he had thought out for himself? And were his Judaizing

<sup>10</sup> *Paul and Jesus*, pp. 7, 8.

opponents after all right in their contention that he misunderstood and misrepresented Jesus? Of course, the question does not assume the same form which it had taken then. The form in which it comes to us now is far more profound, and involves immensely more than it did then. Then it turned on the question as to whether the Gentiles were to be admitted into the church simply on the basis of their faith without submitting to the requirements of the law; now it turns on the question as to whether Paul did not substitute a previously formed conception of the Messiah in place of the actual, historic Jesus. The latter is, of course, far the more serious question; but at bottom they both turn on whether Paul understood Jesus, or whether he was a false guide, and so started the church on a wrong track from the very beginning. Julius Wellhausen and Adolf Harnack are quoted as affirming with emphasis that Paul was the man who truly understood the gospel of Jesus; but Wrede and those who are following in his lead take the opposite view.

And the point on which Paul is supposed especially to have misunderstood Jesus is fundamental. Paul preached a Christ, who was preexistent and who is divine, who is a proper object for our religious veneration and worship, and who, now exalted at the right hand of God, rules in heaven and on earth. He viewed man as a sinful and lost being, utterly incapable by himself of rising out of sin and death to the life eternal; and he taught that through the death of Jesus atonement for sin was made, so that through his blood we have the remission of sins and reconciliation with God. The charge now made is that Paul was wrong on these points, and that all that the church has built on them is false.

The tremendously serious challenge, which modern liberalism has thus made, no one can mistake. As it takes us back to the very beginning, so it goes to the very ground of our faith. It presents a problem, before which all other problems of New Testament criticism, such as that concerning the composition of the Synoptic Gospels, the authorship of the Fourth

Gospel, and the authenticity of the Pauline Epistles, sink into comparative insignificance. If the contention is granted, then not only is the value of the Pauline epistles gone, but a very large proportion of the New Testament Scriptures, besides, is discredited.

Whatever attitude any one may assume with reference to the question at issue, one thing is clear. The challenge calls for a new study of Paul and of his epistles, and along lines which have hitherto been too much neglected. Not only must we restudy the epistles anew from the standpoint of a purely historico-critical exegesis, so as to ascertain just what Paul said and meant; but we must study them in the light of contemporary Jewish literature and thought, and especially in the light of the teaching of Jesus. We need at every step to compare his thought with the Old Testament, the Pseudepigrapha, and the Old Testament Apocrypha, in order that we may ascertain to what extent his thought was anticipated by contemporary Judaism. This is a line of study which has been too much neglected. Then Paul's system must be compared with the teaching of Jesus. To what extent do passages like Rom. 3:24, 25; 4:25; 5:6-8, etc., require Mark 10:45; how far does 2. Cor. 13:14 require the teaching of John 14, 15, 16, etc.? To what extent are Paul's visions hallucinations, as Weiss affirms? And to what extent may we rely on what he claims as revelations? May not modern science furnish far greater justification for Paul's visions, and a far more rational explanation for them, than those psychological explanations which have been offered in this discussion?

It is probable that many will decline to take up this challenge of modern liberalism. Why should they? There is no doubt about the fact that a very large part of the New Testament, as it now stands, is pervaded by the Pauline conception of Christ. As Prof. McGiffert says, the same holds of the historic confessions. It is true likewise of the liturgies and hymnbooks, which have become hallowed by centuries of Christian usage. And yet the problem, which has been raised, will

not be solved by ignoring the challenge thus made. Theological battles are not won by anthemas, nor by men who, like the ostrich, hide their heads in the sand at the approach of danger. Argument can be met only by argument; and even men of extreme views, like Wrede, can be confuted only by stronger arguments on the other side. There is undoubtedly gain in Wrede's outspoken frankness; for we have in him an illustration of the trend of modern liberal thought; and it is well for all of us to have clearly before us the extreme towards which the movement, which he and others like him have started, is drifting. Can we admit that the Pauline conception of Christ and of redemption belongs to the realm of mythology? If not, the necessity is upon us of examining anew the foundations on which our faith rests. If Paul was mistaken in his conception of Christ and of redemption, then the question is urgent, what is left? What are the foundations on which we may build?

While, as stated above, it is not the purpose of this article to enter on a discussion of the merits of the questions involved, the writer may be permitted to indicate very briefly, in conclusion, several of the lines alone which, in his judgment, an answer to this challenge must proceed.

1. The chasm which separates Paul and the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel from the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels is not as great as is assumed by Professor McGiffert. Passages like Matt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22; Mk. 13:32 contain the same high Christology as Paul and John; and the genuineness of these passages can not well be disputed, especially not of the first. On Luke 10:22 Plummer says: "The importance of this verse, which is also in Matt. (11:27), has long been recognized. It is impossible upon any principles of criticism to question its genuineness, or its right to be regarded as among the earliest materials made use of by the Evangelists. And it contains the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel. It is 'like an aerolite from the Johannean heaven'; and for that very reason causes perplexity to those who deny the sol-

idity between the Johannean heaven and the Synoptic earth."<sup>11</sup> The word, "the Son," in Mk. 13:32, says Professor B. W. Bacon, "refers to Jesus personally as a being different in nature from men, and superior, even while on earth, to angels. It reflects the same advanced Christology as 1:11, 24; 9:7; 12:35, 36, a cruder form of the Pauline incarnation doctrine, which in John became systematically metaphysical."<sup>12</sup> And if the Pauline Christology can be thus clearly found in the teaching of the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, the main point in the discussion is secure. It all depends on whether the genuineness of these, and other passages like them, can be maintained; and on that question the writer, at least, does not entertain any serious doubts.

2. Christianity is something vastly more than doctrine. It is a new life. And the revelation of that life is to be sought not simply in the teaching of Jesus. His work and his person are as much a part of that revelation as his works; and to get a complete view of the revelation of his person, we must go not simply to the historic Jesus as he walked and talked in Galilee; we must also take into consideration the risen and exalted Christ, as he manifested himself to the disciples after the resurrection, and to Paul after the ascension, and as he has manifested himself to millions of believing souls since then in the experiences of their Christian lives. We must study the sum total of the impression, which he made on his contemporaries, and the sum total of the impression which he has made on the world. Can that be explained on any assumption short of that which lies at the basis of the whole Pauline conception?

3. Very much depends on our interpretation of what Paul claims as revelations from the risen and exalted Christ. Was the vision on the way to Damascus a hallucination? Or can we maintain that it was caused by the actual appearance of the risen Christ in some real objective form? We believe that the

<sup>11</sup> *The International Critical Commentary on Luke*, p. 282.

<sup>12</sup> *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*, p. 189.

latter can be maintained. It certainly was not an appearance in the flesh in the same sense in which he had appeared in the flesh before his crucifixion. It is somewhat surprising that there should be need of meeting such a crude conception, or that a man like Wrede should think it worth while to remark on it. But that is not saying that the risen Christ can not have appeared to Paul at all. So long as we believe that Christ is risen, so long we must be ready to admit the possibility of a real objective appearance to those who were prepared to see him, unless we should take the position that it is impossible for God and for spirits in any way to reveal themselves to men. And such a hypothesis is certainly unscientific.

4. Paul was a contemporary of Jesus. He probably knew far more of the historic Jesus, as he had walked and talked in Galilee, than is usually supposed. He certainly had far better facilities for knowing all the facts of the life of Jesus than we have to-day. He had opportunities of testing his view of the person of Christ by comparison with the words of Jesus such as we do not possess to-day. And if we grant the reality of his revelation, especially the objective reality of the appearance of Jesus by the roadside near Damascus, we seem to be forced to the conclusion that he had exceptional facilities for forming a correct estimate of his person. On the supposition of the reality of such an actual objective appearance, Paul was in a better position for forming a correct conception of the Christ than any of his contemporaries. He alone had the privilege of seeing the Christ in his full unclouded glory. The other disciples, assuming again the reality of the appearances after the resurrection, saw him only in that interimistic period between the resurrection and the ascension. When he ascended, a cloud received him out of their sight. They were not permitted to follow him, even with their eyes, until he sat down at the right hand of the Father in glory everlasting. Paul saw him there; and that was no small part of his qualification for giving us a correct interpretation of his person.



5. After Wrede's bold declaration that the Pauline Christology is simply the conception which the later Judaism had formed of their expected Messiah, those who would hold to that Christology can hardly decline to examine anew the picture of the Messiah which is found in the Pseudepigrapha and other Jewish writings. And it is at first somewhat startling to find how largely the Pauline conception had been anticipated. Yet as Wrede himself implies, every feature of the Pauline Christ can not be explained by the extant apocalyptic writings; and until data are at hand which will do so, we may well decline to follow his guess that Paul simply derived his conception from contemporary Jewish literature. Besides, granting all that can be shown from the extant literature with reference to the similarity between the Pauline conception and that found in that literature, the large question still remains, May not the conception still be true, notwithstanding the fact that it was in part anticipated by Jewish thinkers? Is the fact that these Jewish thinkers, in their longing for a divine deliverance, conceived of the Messiah as a heavenly being coming down to earth to bring salvation, an argument against the possibility of the incarnation? May not that have been one way in which God prepared his people for the glorious fact? Surely, if the incarnation of the Son of God was the one divine event toward which the whole creation moves, it is more probable that there would have been anticipations of the fact in the thought and longing of God's people than the reverse. Jesus himself acknowledged the truth underlying the Old Testament prophecies. May not those who lived under the constant inspiration of those prophecies have been enabled to make large guesses at the truth? That there is truth even in the ethnic religions is coming to be recognized more and more. Shall the fact that an important doctrine of the New Testament has been in part anticipated by the uncanonical writings of later Judaism be counted as an argument against its truth?

LANCASTER, PA.

### III.

## THE CHURCH: IS IT LOYAL TO ITS MISSION?

S. Z. BEAM.

The Church is divine-human in its constitution—divine, because God instituted it with Jesus Christ as its Head; human, because its organization consists of men and women.

Its object is to extend the Kingdom of God to the uttermost bounds of the earth, by bringing men and women to the obedience of Christ. Jesus Himself laid the foundation on which the superstructure of the kingdom is to be built. He is Himself the chief corner-stone, the Prophets and Apostles being the foundation (I Cor. 3: 11, Eph. 2: 20).

It is propagated by the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the holy sacraments (Matt. 24: 14, conf. Matt. 4: 23). Its ultimate aim is the glory of God in the salvation of mankind (I Pet. 2: 12, 4: 11). To this end the Apostles and the Church were endued with power from on high, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who was given by the Father and the Son, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 1-4).

In the progress of its work it must subdue the antagonism of sinful human nature, which is diametrically opposed to God and His sovereignty. At every step of its onward march of conquest, all the barriers which human and satanic ingenuity can invent have been employed to minify, and, if possible, nullify all its efforts. Jesus Himself met this opposition. In preaching the Gospel of the kingdom He was confronted, antagonized and crucified by the men whom He came to save. A similar fate the Apostles and many of the early Christians suffered at the hands of sinful men. And the work of the Church, in promoting the kingdom of God, has been a continued struggle with the opposition of sinful men, from the time of Christ, and the day of Pentecost, to the present

hour. The pride of learning, the love of riches, the demon of selfishness and the ambition of worldly power have combined their forces to impede the progress of the Church, and to frustrate its efforts to advance the kingdom.

But to the glory of its Living Head it has continued to wage an unremitting warfare against sin in all its forms, and, in the face of all adverse forces, she has gone forth to the conquest of the world and millions have been won to the kingdom whose saintly lives have borne testimony to the new creating and transforming power of the Gospel. And while experiencing persecution and suffering martyrdom among her converts, through all the ages, she still lives and grows with increasing vigor and widening influence for righteousness, and the gates of Hades have not prevailed against her.

Her presence has been felt in every sphere of human life and activity, so that she has exercised a molding and modifying influence on the course of history. And her presence cannot be ignored with impunity in any nation where she has obtained a foothold, although she pretends not to meddle with political affairs. On the night of the Savior's birth the angels sang "Peace on earth." And while universal peace may be counted among the blessings of the distant future, it must be admitted that the signs of its coming reign are visible wherever the Christian standards have been planted. A diligent student of history cannot fail to perceive the wonderful change that has slowly, gradually and surely taken place among the nations. The world, in the early days of Christianity, may be compared to a seething caldron of warring elements. For a short period, indeed, in the days of Christ, the world was outwardly at peace, because it was held in subjection by the Roman power. But underneath the surface the elements of rebellion, like the illusive quiet of the seemingly extinct volcano, were gathering their forces, ready to burst forth with resistless fury at the first opportunity. Nation was against nation, tribe against tribe, Jew hated Gentile and Gentile despised Jew, Greek hated barbarian, and barbarian hated Greek, and, in

consequence, the centuries that followed were drenched in blood.

For ages might was considered right, and the only arbiter among the nations was the sword. And yet, in the midst of all this turmoil and slaughter, the Church of Christ, through men of God's good will, was seeking to allay the storms of war, preaching peace by Jesus Christ. Slowly, indeed even almost imperceptibly, but surely, the leaven of peace and righteousness, instilled by the Church into the hearts of men, began to allay the bloodthirsty passions of men, leading them to consider better methods of settling their differences than by the arbitrament of the sword. And now, though the sword has not yet been beaten into the plowshare, yet national disputes, which, in former days culminated in bloody war, are settled by diplomacy or arbitration. The greatest and highest of the civilized nations take greater pride in diplomacy than in war. And diplomacy itself, which formerly was used to conceal, has at last come to express, the real meaning of its language. And the rulers of the great nations are exercising their ingenuity and wielding their powers for the promotion of peace, while international intercourse is carried on in friendly rivalry. Industrial arts and commercial intercourse are claiming the energy and wisdom of the nations, because these pursuits of peace have been discovered to be of greater value to their people than indiscriminate slaughter. Instead, therefore, of enriching themselves by wholesale robbery at the sacrifice of human life, as in ages past, the nations have learned to practice the arts of trade and commerce, and are supplying each other's wants through peaceful and friendly barter.

Through the mediation and the educational influences of the missionaries of the Church of Christ in pagan and heathen countries, the peoples have come into communication with the more advanced civilizations of Christian peoples. Friendly relations are established; they learn to know each other, the needs and aspirations of men are found to be the same in all races, and they have begun to realize and appreciate the uni-

versal truth declared ages ago, that God hath made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth (Acts 17: 26).

Men were slow, even in countries where Christianity prevailed, to recognize the brotherhood of men and the Fatherhood of God, perhaps, because sinful human nature inclined them to practice "hatred and malice and all uncharitableness" as more manly than forgiveness and good will.

Doubtless such progress, in the way of peace, may be attributed, by some men, to the evolution of civilization. And this may be admitted, if we recognize that the civilization was developed and promoted under the benign influence of Christianity. By this we mean only that the irenic element of our civilization is due to Christianity, for it is equally true that civilizations of a high order existed before the advent of Christianity, as for example in Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, Greece and Rome. But theirs was warlike and not peaceful. And so we are sure that the peaceful condition of our civilization is the product of Christianity, as preached and practiced by the Church, and it has come to exist in fulfilment of prophecy regarding the reign of Christ as Prince of Peace (see Isaiah, IX and XI). It is a significant fact that a similar condition does not exist anywhere except where Christianity has begun to prevail.

Again. Slavery was universally prevalent in the time of Christ, and for a long period afterwards. And although Jesus and the Apostles never directly meddled with social and political relations, the ameliorating influence of the Gospel, in the course of time, led many masters to manumit their slaves and treat them as brethren. But others, who still retained them in slavery, were impelled by the spirit and genius of Christianity to make their servitude less rigorous and degrading; for it inspired in them a mild and gentle disposition which was foreign to the cruel and barbarous character of heathenism.

And we know that this influence continued to make itself felt during succeeding centuries, until to-day, when human

slavery has been banished from all countries where uncorrupted Christianity prevails. And in harmony with the gentle Spirit which mitigated the cruelty of slavery and finally gave the slave his freedom, Christianity has also exerted a mighty power in softening the rigors and cruelty of war. And while there is a great incompatibility between Christianity and the spirit that wages war, it is still true that all civilized nations have come to recognize that wounded soldiers and prisoners of war are entitled to protection from cruel barbarity, and to be treated as human beings. International law requires this, and the nation which violates this law deserves and suffers the scorn and condemnation of the world. And thus while the nations have not yet risen to the sublime level of the Golden Rule, yet they feel and recognize its moral force, and are impelled by it to control their mad passions in time of war, and to treat fallen enemies as fellow beings entitled to sympathy and generous treatment. As the Gospel proclaimed by the Church has taught men to recognize the unity of the race, and brought them into more intimate commercial and religious communication, the sense and feeling of brotherhood has come largely to prevail. This feeling has been slow and faltering in its growth; imperceptible and unconscious it may have been in most of men, yet it has been true and sure, and God has come to be acknowledged as the common Father of us all.

The planting and promoting of the kingdom of God, besides lifting our civilization to higher levels, has also implanted in the life of men the principle of civil and religious freedom. The true idea of freedom, civil or religious, was never dreamed of before the revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ. When Jesus said "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," He therefore enunciated a principle of which the wisest of mankind had never conceived. And therefore the Jews, the most enlightened people in the time of Christ, utterly failed to comprehend it. But the kingdom of God, which means the rule and reign of Jesus Christ in the human heart, carries along with its conquests the principle of free-

dom, planting it in the life of man, nurturing it into active exercise, making it the motive power, through the Christian centuries, which sustains them in their mighty struggles against oppression and wrong.

Much of the turmoil that agitates the belated civilizations of to-day are but the birth pangs of freedom, struggling for delivery. The spiritual freedom with which the Son of God makes men free creates a longing for freedom from oppression and wrong. In countries like England, Germany and the United States where the Evangelical Church exercises her legitimate influence, this freedom has been largely attained. But where it is struggling in other lands, it is plainly to be seen, as the result of the activity of missionaries of Christianity. Witness, for example, China and Japan, where the greatest empire in the world is awakening, and where in the other such wonderful developments have already taken place. Behold the salutary changes in Turkey, the transforming of Korea and the revolution in Persia, the agitations in India, the advances in Africa and the restlessness and upward movements among other nations. All these are indications that God reigns and is extending His Kingdom to all the ends of the earth. Who can successfully deny the influence of the Church through its missionaries and their educational institutions in all these movements towards higher levels, moral and political, among the nations? To these struggles Jesus alluded, at least in part, when He said, "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10: 34). And we believe that the regenerating of spiritual life, through the preaching of the Gospel, is productive of these great world movements. For it is certain that the influence of the church is not confined to its immediate converts to Christianity, but the principles of our holy religion are diffused among the people in far larger circles than those constituted by professed believers of the Gospel. And while many engaged in the struggle are not actuated by Christly motives, it is still true that they have im-



bibed their high aspirations from the religion which some of them despise, and they desire to secure the blessings of Christianity without adopting its spiritual principles as their own.

Thus history is at this day demonstrating that the efforts for human freedom cannot be restrained. On the contrary, the barriers are falling away, and political and civil liberty, as well as liberty of conscience, is forcing its way and securing its rights from reluctant rulers. And social and political life, emancipated from oppressive rulers, is advancing to higher moral levels, and He whose right it is to reign, is asserting His dominion among all peoples.

The Church, to whose credit, under God, we attribute these blessings, is still imperfect in its work. Its practice has never risen to the level of its high ideals. Human nature has never reached the ideal of perfect manhood, even among the regenerated. Christ alone enjoys the distinction of perfect manhood, and this is the ideal towards which the church directs its members. Its principles therefore are right, and its ideals perfect. But no institution with which man is intimately associated can be perfect, for human nature, even when regenerated and consecrated to the service of God, is still weighed down by the burden of sin.

Is the church then disloyal to its mission? Is it delinquent in its duty to the present generation? Or, to use the present methods of inquiry, are the churches of to-day meeting the necessities of the age? or are they "lagging behind"? "What is the matter with the church?" This question has been asked, in view of the very many charges of delinquency that have been made to their discredit. In fact, their shortcomings have been so magnified, and so oft repeated, that many of her members and friends are tempted to believe that she is a hopeless wreck.

We have been told by magazine critics and self-important preachers that the churches are a failure. They have lost their grip upon the laboring men. The masses of the people are not attracted to the services. The ministers despise and

neglect the poor, and are obsequious to the rich. The churches are losing ground. Their growth does not keep pace with that of the population. Men do not attend the services because the preaching is perfunctory, humdrum, jejune, and makes no appeal to true manhood. Other organizations are everywhere doing the work which the churches ought, but fail to do. And so the churches are credited with almost total failure in all departments of human life and are hopeless. And to cap the climax, some wise critic has informed us that "there are more Christians out of the churches than in them." Their shortcomings are innumerable and their good works are *nil*. If all these charges were true the case would be hopeless indeed. The churches, we believe, are fully conscious of their shortcomings, and straining every nerve to improve their methods and practices, and adapting themselves to the needs, not to the wishes of the times.

For the most part, the above charges are groundless and exist mostly in the imaginations of their authors. The spirit in which they are made shows that they arise largely from antagonism, indifference regarding spiritual things, and an inordinate love of the world with its sinful pleasures, and from pessimism. It will, of course, be difficult, if not impossible, to convince such people that the churches are better than they represent them. Still it may be useful to call attention to the fallacy of the charges, and thereby strengthen our own faith in the church, which such charges seem largely designed to undermine.

In contradiction to these various charges we flatly affirm that the Church of Jesus Christ, represented by the several evangelical denominations of Christendom to-day, is *alive, active, aggressive and successful*. With all her shortcomings she has done more for the welfare of mankind and met more antagonism than any other institution that ever existed. In all the history of the human race no other agency has done so much for the cause of righteousness, the administration of justice, the promotion of freedom, the elevation of woman and the

advancement of equality and brotherhood among men. In all respects she has proved herself to be the bearer of holy light to sinful men immersed in moral and spiritual darkness. And to-day she is going triumphantly forward, as the pillar and ground of God's saving truth, winning trophies for His kingdom, delivering them from the darkness of sin into the light and liberty of the children of God.

In evidence we appeal to her numerical growth, as compared with the increase of the population of the country. It is far more rapid. The increase in population from 1890 to 1906 was 33.8 per cent. In the same period the total increase of the membership of the churches has been 60.4 per cent., or nearly double that of the population. These are the official figures of the Census Bureau recently published. The activity of the church has never been greater since the day of Pentecost. The Women's Missionary Societies, The Laymen's Missionary Movement, the great Sunday-school army, the Young People's societies, and many other auxiliary organizations afford an undeniable exhibition of the energetic activity with which the churches are pushing forward their work.

To these active agencies may be added the national and international conventions, representing all evangelical churches, looking towards the unification of effort to evangelize the world. Think of churches aggregating a membership of eighteen millions assembling their forces in a single convention to consider ways and means of advancing the kingdom of God, and promoting fraternal fellowship, by united effort.

We may not hope for organic union for a long time to come. Perhaps it may never come. It may not, indeed, be desirable. But such meetings indicate an inward spiritual unity which is breaking down the barriers to fraternal fellowship. And they demonstrate to a gainsaying world the essential unity of God's people, in spite of the many creeds and rituals by which they are outwardly distinguished, and prove that their one great aim is the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. And so the "Communion of Saints" is realized as never before, and the

united influence of the churches is felt in the conversion of men, and in the advancement of righteousness and joy and peace in the Holy Spirit.

Special reference may be made to the Federal council, which met in Philadelphia in December, 1908, representing 18 million members and 40 million adherents. And again we point to the "World's Missionary Conference" at Edinburgh in June, 1910, whose object is the spread of the Gospel in all lands, and the universal reign of the kingdom of God.

The churches are not dead. They are alive and active, and loyal to their glorious mission. Still another evidence that the church is loyal to her mission is the increased and constantly growing contributions of her members, not only for congregational purposes, but for benevolent enterprises of every description, and for the support and endowment of her educational institutions. The contributions of the churches in the United States for these purposes were never so high in proportion to their membership. This statement can easily be verified by any one who will compare their annual reports for the years that are passed.

Church edifices, well adapted for religious services and for Sunday-school purposes, have been increasing in this country, at the rate of about eight new buildings per day. The waste places in our own country are being occupied, while the work in the field of foreign missions has never been more prosperous or more promising than it is now. And while contributions for this purpose are larger than ever before, the number of consecrated men and women offering their services for this glorious work is even greater than the contributions.

The fruits of the work of our foreign missions are encouragingly plentiful, and are visible, not only in the number of actual converts to the religion of Christ, and the additions to the churches, but in the leavening influences exerted by the teaching, and exemplary lives, of the missionaries, upon the social life of the people.

Christian schools and hospitals have given object lessons to

the people in heathen lands, showing them the world-wide difference between the moribund religions and civilizations of paganism and those in Christian countries, so that, as intimated before, whole nations are waking up and reaching out their hands for the higher, better and more enlightened civilization of Christendom. To which may be added that the reflex influence of the work of foreign missions on Christian lands and peoples is equally apparent. The good we do to others returns to us in the experience of a deeper, wider and higher spiritual life, as well as in blessings in temporal and material prosperity. In consequence of the new life and energy generated among the heathen people, they are coming into industrial and commercial relations with us, and thus contribute to our material prosperity. Thus through the pioneer efforts of Christian missionaries, men of hitherto strange and unknown races are learning to know each other, and a fraternal feeling grows up and is coming to prevail among the races such as never existed before. In this way each, in fact, has found the other to be of like nature and passions and wants with themselves, and mutual sympathy and fraternal fellowship become the bonds of a common brotherhood.

Once more, if we turn our eyes to the benevolent and beneficent institutions of our own country, not to mention those of England and Germany, we shall easily see (unless our eyes are closed to the truth), the benign and Christ-like spirit which Christianity has created and diffused with a lavish hand among the people. We may be reminded here that many of these institutions of mercy and helpfulness to the needy and suffering, do not belong to any church organization, are independent of the churches, and are doing a work which the churches ought, but fail to do. But we ask in reply, "whence did the people who founded and support these institutions derive their inspiration? And the inevitable answer is, that it came from the teaching and practice of the churches. Their supporters are members of the churches, received their religious training in the churches, and are impelled by their

example to do such good works. But many non-church members also contribute for these purposes; yes, but they also owe their moral character and benevolent disposition to the genius and spirit of the churches. And while they refuse to openly identify themselves with the churches, they cannot free themselves from their elevating influence on the social relations in which they stand. It, therefore, abundantly appears that the churches are, after all, entitled to the credit of having furnished the inspiration which leads to such beneficence. And so we may say that the churches are, directly and indirectly, doing their divinely appointed work. And while some do these things apparently to discredit the Church, we may yet rejoice that good is done, "whether in pretence or in truth." For the church is "set for the defense of the Gospel," and Christ is proclaimed, whether of faction or sincerely, and the interest of His kingdom is subserved.

But again, we may ask, who, in general, are the leaders in all those movements which make for righteousness and for the alleviation of human sorrow and suffering? Who are they who take the initiative in the promotion of temperance, and in demanding the keeping of the Lord's day holy, in waging war against oppression and wrong, in upholding the administration of justice, in employing every legitimate agency for the overthrow of social and political corruption, and, in fact, for the destruction of all malign influences, and for the universal spread of philanthropy, and for the realization of human brotherhood, and for the advancement of the kingdom of God throughout the world? We answer, the ministers of the churches by their own personal efforts, and members of their churches under their leadership and guidance.

There are, doubtless, some men in the ministry, as there are in every profession, who have missed their calling. But, as a class, the ministers of the churches in the United States are equal to any other class of men. In general they are highly educated and intelligent. They have given some of the best years of their lives, and spent great sums of money, in prepara-

tion for their work. Most of them might have entered some lucrative calling and secured for themselves and their families a competence, or even great wealth and social and political influence, such only as wealth could afford. But instead, they have devoted their lives and all their energies to the advancement of the kingdom of God, and in so doing they have sacrificed worldly interests and ambitions, and given their time and intellectual abilities to the promotion of the spiritual and eternal interests of their fellowmen. They have contented themselves with a mere pittance of earthly pleasures and financial support, preferring "rather to suffer ill-treatment with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of the world (Heb. 11: 25, 26), for they look unto the recompense of the reward."

Now, in consideration of what has been said, it appears to the writer that the churches, with all their faults and shortcomings, are doing a noble work for the honor of God and the salvation of men. They are heroically struggling against sin in all its myriad forms. They are fully alive to the needs of the time. They are active in every good word and work. They are aggressive in their efforts to bring men to Christ, and in a very encouraging degree, they are successful in the promotion of the kingdom of God on earth.

In conclusion, it may be proper to say that it is one of the remarkable and curious phenomena of history that the greatest good is universally secured through the greatest sacrifice. The most valued things of earth cost the most labor, and the greatest hardships are endured by men who desire to possess them.

The redemption of mankind was secured by the sacrifice of the Redeemer, and the Church, in its endeavor to spread His kingdom, must meet the same opposition and struggle through all difficulties with heroic courage, in order to accomplish its high and holy purpose. There may be "Christians out of the Church," but if the evangelization of the nations and the



universal reign of Christ depended on their loyal efforts, the case would be hopeless indeed.

In view of all these things, we think, the churches individually and collectively are bound together in the bonds of Christian love and guided by the Spirit of God, that they are loyal to their mission, and that God is graciously owning their imperfect but well-meant efforts to extend His kingdom. They may well reply to their advance critics in the language of their great Leader and Captain, "For which of these good works do ye stone us?"

#### ADDENDUM.

After the above article was written, the following paragraph occurred in the *Outlook* for January 8, 1910, page 57. "Nor has religion, in spite of the predictions of its decline which constantly fill the columns of the newspapers, lost its hold upon the givers of the country. Last year there was devoted to missions twelve millions of dollars in recognition of the fact that the missionary work of the churches has never been so nobly conceived and so nobly conducted as today. Special gifts to individual churches and for specific religious work of other kinds amounts to nearly ten millions of dollars; and it must be remembered that these gifts which have been brought to the attention of the public are only part of a vast generosity which flows, not only in great streams, but in rivulets from all parts of the country and all sorts of people for all kinds of work."

We quote this paragraph in corroboration of our own statements regarding the vast growth in benevolent contributions by the churches and their adherents.

CARROLLTON, O.

#### IV.

### THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

JULIUS F. VORNHOLT.

Can man by searching find out God? this is an old, old question; and though it has been answered, positively and negatively, time and again, it always comes up again. This in itself shows that it is a vital question. Even our own enlightened age could not pass it by; in fact, it has been more abundantly discussed in recent times than ever before. The answer has, of course, been varied. While only extreme skeptics have denied the existence of God, the mode of man's apprehension of God has been defined in a great variety of ways.

Christian theologians have held that in the Sacred Scriptures there is a true revelation of God. This revelation is held to have been entirely miraculous, given by vision, or by audible word, or by the internal teaching of the Spirit. Outside of this special revelation, no true knowledge of God can be gained. We may take Calvin as a type. He holds that a knowledge of God has been universally implanted in the mind of man. Further, that in the external world and in man's own physical constitution, there is a manifestation of God's attributes. The essence, indeed, of God is unknowable "Those, therefore, who, in considering this question, propose to inquire what the essence of God is, only delude us with frigid speculation." Only such a knowledge as may lead us to worship God is profitable for us. And to such a knowledge God's manifestation in nature ought to lead us. But owing to human sin, the mind has been so perverted, that a special revelation has been necessary. This has been given in the Bible, and apart from this there is no true knowledge of God; not among philosophers, still less among the unlearned. For a true understanding of the Bible, in turn, the internal testi-

mony of the Spirit is necessary. This may be taken as a fair type of the orthodox protestant view. It certainly embodies important aspects of truth, but its weakness lies in its inadequate view of revelation. With a different view of revelation the problem will present itself in a totally different light.

A great deal of religious thought has been dualistic in nature. God is conceived as transcendent to the world. The supernatural is something that lies in a literal sense *supra* and *extra* the natural. Yet at the same time, strange to say, an effort was made to reason from the natural world to God. This tendency has received classic expression in English Deism and German Rationalism, which was the dominant thought of the eighteenth century. According to this mode of thought, the world is a mechanism, wisely constructed by God in the beginning, endued with resident forces, and now left to itself to operate according to the mechanical laws that had been imposed on it once for all in the beginning. Sometimes it might be necessary for God to interfere in this process to adjust the machinery, as it were, and so miracles would result. But the tendency was to reduce miracles to a minimum and to explain historical miracles by natural causes. So also revelation was dispensed with, and man was left to his own reason to teach him the religion of nature, as it was called, viz., a moral code plus the belief in God and in the immortality of the soul. Both of these articles of faith were thought capable of mathematical demonstration. For instance, we may reason from the world to its maker. The world clearly exhibits certain designs. It has been constructed to subserve man's welfare and happiness. And by contemplating the world, we may reason, not only, that God exists, but also, that he possesses the attributes of wisdom, goodness, power, etc.

This style of argument has been annihilated once for all by Kant. According to Kant, knowledge is only of the phenomenal world, but not of the reality that lies back of it. When thought goes beyond these limits, and seeks to determine

reality itself, it falls into contradiction with itself. He takes up, in particular, the traditional arguments for the existence of God, and shows their invalidity on the ground that they all involve the impossible leap from thought to being. The idea of God is necessary for thought, but it is a purely regulative idea, in as much as it sets up an ideal of complete unity which thought must seek to attain in its determination of the phenomenal world. But we may not reason from necessity of thought to necessity of existence. Kant's purpose, however, was not to destroy religion, but to establish it. He denied knowledge of God in order to make room for faith. For if thought be given the right to speak about God at all, it may deny God as well as affirm him. And this has been only too often the case. So Kant desired once for all to destroy skepticism, by limiting theoretical knowledge to the phenomenal world, and by founding religion anew upon faith, by reaffirming God as a postulate of the practical reason.

As far as the negative aspects of Kant's work are concerned, it has certainly rendered a valuable service. If the presuppositions of Deism are true, we can not get to God in the way that was there proposed. We can in that way find, at best, a master mechanic but no God. And the religious consciousness itself contradicts the method of Deism most decisively. For it finds God, not by such a process of reasoning but rather by immediate revelation. It does not ask that God's existence be proven, but is immediately certain of him, as much so as of the physical world, or of the moral law, and finds him as an overwhelming fact, from whom there is no escape, even if such were desirable.

"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?  
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?  
If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there:  
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there.  
If I take the wings of the morning,  
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;  
Even there shall thy hand lead me,  
And thy right hand shall hold me."

It is from this point of view that we can understand the prevalence of the idea of revelation in all religions, and the right of this idea over against all forms of rationalism. The religious consciousness is always aware, that its idea of God is not the result of a long process of reasoning, but breaks forth from the depths and comes like a sudden insight, carrying an overwhelming conviction with itself. And what else is this but a revelation from God himself? And it is to such a revelation that we must look as the source for a true knowledge of God, rather than to human speculation. If the issue were between rationalism and Calvinism, we should not hesitate long which side to espouse.

The knowledge of God, then, is based on what we may properly call revelation. Our basic fact is the religious consciousness, and here we find the self-impartation of God himself. The best thought of recent times seems to have come to such a standpoint. God gives himself in human experience. So much is clear. The question, however, arises at this point, how is God involved in human experience? And here a divergence of view arises. In various ways the attempt has been made to mark off a separate realm for religious experience, to hedge it in within certain limits, to assign to it a distinctive faculty.

There is, first the philosophy of feeling. According to Schleiermacher religion is the feeling of absolute dependence. Our relation to the phenomenal world gives rise only to a feeling of relative dependence; so that, if the religious feeling is traced to its source it leads us beyond the phenomenal world, and thus there arises in us the consciousness of God. God is immediately present in feeling and is not an object of knowledge. Schleiermacher tries to show by particular cases how any intellectual conception of God is inadequate. The God that he finds by his method of approach, is practically identical with the universe, not, however, in its aspect of multiplicity, but of unity, that abstract unity, from which all difference has been eliminated. And again we see how the in-

tellec is ruled out. For it is in the nature of intellect to introduce distinction, and God, therefore, is beyond its reach.

Of greater influence has been the Kantian distinction between faith and knowledge, which has so largely dominated theological thought in recent times. But, in spite of its popularity, we believe that every such effort to hedge in religious experience can not be permanently successful. It contradicts the unity of the mind, and smacks too much of the old "faculty psychology," where each function of the mind was supposed to be complete in itself and independent of all the other functions. We know to-day that the mind is one. And if God is present to the mind at all, he can not be limited to one faculty. All must in some way be involved. We never have pure feeling. Feeling always accompanies the exercise of the intellect and the will, and marks off their activity as peculiarly our own. Schleiermacher himself could not produce the absolute divorce that he aimed at, and reflective thought, though in theory denied, is again and again unconsciously implied. The same holds true of the Kantian separation of faith from knowledge. Such a separation, if it could be maintained, would in the end be disastrous to both.

All such theories, moreover, do violence to the facts of the religious consciousness. The consciousness of God, far from being an isolated fact of experience, becomes the center of the whole life, around which all of experience is now organized. It is the light in which everything else is estimated. It is the dominating factor, to which everything else must be subordinated. We see this perhaps more in primitive religions than in our own; for there, life develops more spontaneously than in our own time with its forced and artificial arrangements. In primitive society, everything is dominated by the idea of God. God is the ruler of the people. It is from him that they get their laws; every transaction in private or in public life must receive his sanction. In later times distinctions are drawn and separations are made. One realm of experience after another declares its independence of what becomes to be

perceived as the fettering influence of religion; the state is no longer ruled by the church; kings and lawmakers carry on their functions without consulting the oracles of the gods, depending rather on their enlightened reason to tell them what is for the good of their people; the whole of business life and intercourse becomes secularized; and finally science itself, which for so long was the handmaid of the church, becomes godless. It was Laplace, I think, who, when Napoleon remarked that his theory of the heavens accorded no place to God, answered: "Sir, I have no need for that hypothesis." And that certainly characterizes the attitude of every scientist to-day in his scientific labors, be his religious views what they may. Science can not appeal to God as an explanation of its mysteries. That would explain everything and therefore nothing. Science has but one task—to explain the phenomena of the world by linking phenomenon to phenomenon in a causal series. God is not a phenomenon and does not, therefore, come within the province of science. Such independence of science is necessary; it must have a free field for investigation, and even must have the privilege of the regressus ad infinitum. This is as much in the interest of religion as of science; for in the end, the glory of God will be only the more manifest, if science is unhampered by religious dogmas, to make the fullest possible investigation of the world.

But all the while we should bear in mind, that this division, and this exclusion of God from the world of the scientist, is an artificial contrivance of man. In the beginning it was not so. Experience, then, was a unity; and a return to unity is the ideal that must guide all our investigation—a return, not to that unity from which human experience started, in which there was as yet no consciousness of difference, but rather to that higher, richer unity, which contains within itself the reconciliation of all these difference. For science, this unity can come only at the end of a long, laborious research. But, it seems to me, for the religious consciousness, that unity is ever a present fact. God and the world are one. The world is



referred to God as its creator and ground; God finds in the world the sphere of his manifestation. The religious consciousness, then, is not mere faith, or mere feeling, but contains within itself what we may call a metaphysical element. And when we proceed from the religious consciousness to doctrinal formulation, we must take into due consideration this metaphysical element.

I would say, therefore, that the fundamental conception of God is that of his immanence in the world of our experience. This is involved in a proper estimate of the universal religious consciousness, which declares unmistakably that the consciousness of God has the tendency always to become the center around which all human experience is organized and by which it is dominated. And this is true even where the intellectual conception of God is that of transcendence rather than of immanence. For the position here taken by no means maintains that where man reflects on the God who is present in his experience, he should necessarily come to an adequate conception of him, or that the analysis which he gives of his religious consciousness, should be, in all respects, correct. That is a different thing altogether, of which we will have more to say later on.

Starting, then, with the immanence of God, we may gain a more definite knowledge of him, by contemplating him in his self-manifestation in the world of experience. But before we proceed further, we wish to say a few words more about the subject of revelation. Revelation is a universal fact. But this does not mean that all is on one level of clearness and truth. The latter depends on the capacity of the human subject; for revelation is a human, as well as a divine, activity. Whatever value for the student of religion, the sacred books of other religions may have for us Christians, normative value is assigned to the Biblical revelation alone. Here we have the oracles of God. And nothing can be more refreshing, after reading some of the religious literature of the heathen, or wandering through some of the arid regions of human spec-

ulation, than to turn again to this book, with its ever new message to the human heart. This is indeed a fountain of living waters. These prophets and apostles may have been very primitive in their scientific and philosophical conceptions, but they were men with a vision for the divine; they communed with God face to face; they spoke with him as friend speaks with friend; and what they impart to us has all the freshness of truth seen at first hand. These men have seen through the veil and have caught a glimpse of the reality behind, and what they relate appeals to the heart as in very truth a direct revelation from God.

The Bible then remains as the preeminent source for the knowledge of God. There is absolutely no ground for the view so often stated by advocates of the old order, that the higher criticism has torn the Bible to shreds, and has left us nothing but the covers. This is all rubbish and utterly misconceives the purpose and result of higher criticism. The old view of the Bible as an infallible oracle on all subjects whatsoever, is indeed done away. This view is inseparably connected with the old view of the supernatural as something that can manifest itself only by breaking into the natural order from without. Wherever the divine appears on that theory, it is, therefore, purely divine; and being independent of human mediation, it is also free from human error. With the passing of supernaturalism, such a Bible also has gone. We will not mourn its departure; for we have received in its place a truer Bible, and one that lies infinitely nearer to us; that is flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. For, from the new stand-point we realize that the God, who spoke to prophets and apostles, is still speaking to us in that continuous stream of revelation, of which the Bible is but the culmination. And we can appreciate its message all the more because we do not have to accept it blindly as an external authority, but are aware of a kindred revelation within, answering Spirit to Spirit.

"Were not our eye to the great sun akin,  
The sun it nevermore could see.  
Dwelt not in us the great God's power,  
I ween, God's works no joy to us could be."

Since God does dwell in us, the joy can not fail to come; and the more of the indwelling, the more of the joy there will be. The doctrine of continuous revelation, far from diminishing the value of the Bible, first puts us in a position where we can realize fully its authoritativeness as the norm for our thinking. And as such a norm, the modern Christian will still use his Bible as the basis for his knowledge of God.

Within the Bible itself a distinction has often been drawn, and the teaching and self-consciousness of Jesus has been made normative for the interpretation of the rest of the Bible. This tendency has culminated in one of the modern parties, which has raised the cry: Back to Jesus. The teaching and self-consciousness of Jesus is to be the basis of Christian doctrine, while the teaching of the Apostles is discredited, and looked upon as in many respects a departure from the purity of the gospel of Jesus. However helpful this kind of criticism may have been, it seems to have nearly run its course, and it is being realized on every hand that such a separation is impossible. The historical Jesus and the theological reflections of the Apostolic age are so interwoven with each other that a separation is an impossibility. This is true not only of the epistles, which give practically no historical information about Jesus, but also of the synoptic gospels. The pendulum has already swung around again, and the burning question of the day is: Jesus or Christ, which was discussed in the January number of the *REVIEW*. This tendency is not a new one. The modern advocates of this distinction go back to Lessing and his dictum that you cannot make contingent facts of history the proof for eternal truths of reason. The discussion that is now waging will probably leave its deep impress on the theology of the future.

In quite a different sense from the party above referred to does the Christocentric theology go back to Jesus. For it

the "Christ idea" is the central truth, and this is not an induction from history,—on the contrary, the history of Jesus must itself be read in the light of this Christ idea. The truth of this standpoint depends, I think, on the way in which we define the Christ idea. The Christocentric theology ordinarily simply takes over the Christ of the Chalcedonian creed, and here lies its limitation. If, however, the Christ idea is to be undogmatic and to be really useful for our constructive thinking, it must be taken as a pure principle. It is the glorified Christ, who by his Spirit is immanent in the Christian community as the bond of unity and the source of life and light. Any further definition must come at the end and not at the beginning, and must be made in the light of Christian history and of the Christian consciousness, which are the sphere of the self-manifestation of this principle.

Such a Christ idea, taken as the immanent life principle of the Christian church, and getting its reality from the facts of Christian history, has taken us on distinctively Christian ground as the basis for our knowledge of God. Starting with the general idea of God's immanence, we saw how this created for itself a special revelation, in the light of which the initial principle was itself transformed into the Christ idea; and the general presence of God is seen to be a presence unto redemption, and to create for itself a new sphere of manifestation in the Christian church. To know God we must, therefore, follow this manifestation from Apostolic times until now. This method of deriving the knowledge of God has several distinguishing characteristics:

1. It will be scientific, *i. e.*, based on the divine self-manifestation in Christian experience, and not derived by a purely speculative method. The latter was too largely the case with the Christocentric theology of the past. It started with the Christ idea, into which it first put everything it wanted to be proven, and then proceeded to deduce it again from this idea. Hence the charge of "Allwisserei" made against this theology. The Christ idea, however, as here indicated, is a

pure principle, which derives its reality from the facts of Christian history, and necessitates a study of these facts in a thoroughly scientific way, in order that a knowledge of God may be derived from it.

2. It will be historical. It will survey the whole religious life from the Apostles down to the present. It will take into consideration all preceding theologies, and will study them with sympathetic appreciation. For, however crude some of these theories may have been, they are sure to contain a sound kernel. They are the outgrowth of the faith and vital piety of the age in which they originated, and it is the task of the theologian to pierce to that vital core which gives them truth and the power to appeal convincingly to their age.

In thus basing the knowledge of God on Christian experience, we do not wish to give a narrow interpretation to the term experience. We do not mean any mystic exaltation or ecstasy of feeling. We mean the experience of the Christian in its entirety. And as such it includes at least three elements—physical nature, the self, and the ideal. These three constitute the sphere of the divine self-manifestation. They themselves receive their true meaning by being interpreted in the light of the Christ idea, and thus we construct the Christian view of the world, of man, and of the kingdom of God. And on the other hand, the knowledge of God is based on experience in these three aspects.

In constructing a doctrine of God it is essential to remember that these three aspects of experience constitute a unity. Defective doctrines are generally due to the emphasis of one aspect to the exclusion of the rest. And it is the tendency of intellect constantly to do this. Just as a prism separates the white light of the sun into the various colors of the spectrum, so the intellect breaks up the unity of experience into diverse elements, and then selects one of these, and rules the others out of consideration. Perhaps it is physical nature that is thus favored. The scientist becomes absorbed in the phenomena that here present themselves; he tries to reduce them to their

ultimate terms, and finally says: It is matter that holds within itself the key to the solution of all mysteries. The result is materialism. Or if he has advanced enough to realize that we know nothing of such an underlying material substance, he reads the world in terms of energy, spelled, perhaps with a capital letter. Or whatever is the ultimate reality to which he reduces all phenomena, the resulting theory is sure to be of a materialistic turn, because he bases his induction on physical nature alone. If we remember that the universe of reality includes also the self, it is evident that Ultimate Reality also cannot be less than self-consciousness, whatever more it may be.

On the other hand, theology is apt to ignore physical nature, and so to form a conception of God that is too spiritualistic. This has left its impress on the whole religious life of the past, which has for that reason taken on an ascetic and mystical coloring. Nature is something with which God has nothing to do, consequently also God's servants, in so far as they want to be religious, must scorn nature, and find their true life in the spirit. Practical piety as well as sound theology demands a conception of God that shall be, not less spiritual, but more natural. God is indeed Spirit, but nature also is his work, and the sphere in which the Spirit realizes itself. Renewed emphasis of this element will make God more real to the mind of the present age.

The practical life of the people is intensely secular, and so religion is largely crowded out. In the past, though the dualism of the secular and the sacred was the dominant view, the interests of religion were guarded by a kind of treaty, or neighborly understanding, that neither was to encroach upon the ground of the other, and so the two secured a peaceful existence side by side. Men took enough time from their secular occupations to attend church on Sunday and on the numerous holidays and to attend to the other pious exercises which the church prescribed. But this kind of an external compromise could not endure forever. With the growing complexity

of the secular life, the sphere of religion became ever more restricted. The man of today has no time to go on pilgrimages to sacred places in the interest of his soul. Very few of the weekday holidays are any longer available for religious purposes. And even Sunday has been encroached upon and needs constant protective legislation to keep it from being completely secularized. But even so, many people have little inclination to use Sunday for religious purposes. It hardly seems possible, even if it were desirable, ever to go back to the conditions of the past. If religion is to maintain itself, it must do so, not by reoccupying its place alongside of the secular, but by permeating and taking complete possession of the whole sphere of the secular life, so that, under its inspiration, man may perform all his duties as under the great taskmaster's eye; that he may bring to all his tasks a kind of religious fervor and devotion; and that he may live up to the maxim of the Apostle: "Whether ye eat or drink or whatever ye do, do it all to the glory of God." The ideal of life must be made thoroughly religious. And it can be made such only when the thought of God's immanence in nature has taken such firm hold upon the popular consciousness, that the whole world becomes divine, and that in his daily toil, man looks upon himself, not simply as making a living for himself, but as being a coworker with God in his effort to bring order out of chaos, and making this world ever more fully the embodiment of his divine ideal. And then the distinctively religious observances will also gain a new significance, inasmuch as they will afford the necessary inspiration for such a task.

Again, a true conception of God involves due recognition of the ideal element in experience. Unless this is the case, we will lose sight of God's goodness. For reality, both in the physical world and in human personality, contains evil and sin, and from this point of view the goodness of God can not be vindicated. Moreover, the ignoring of the ideal will inevitably lead to Pantheism. It is on the basis of the ideal that God's transcendence is firmly established. For while the ideal



*is in reality, it is never fully exhausted by reality, but lies over and above reality as its goal. And in our own personal life it is with the ideal that we identify ourselves. That is our real self, of which our works and present state of being are but an inadequate expression. It is not, therefore, by what we are or by what we do that we would be judged, but by what we aspire to be. All else is but the outer man, the members, the flesh, in which dwells sin. The inner man is the real self. And so it is in the larger life of God in the world. Would you know God as he is, then look not at reality in its abstract, phenomenal appearance, but look at the ideal, which is gradually realizing itself in the world of reality; which is above and back of reality, and in it as the energizing principle, carrying it onward and upward to an ever fuller realization of what is true and good. From what has been said, it is also evident that we must not conceive of the ideal in separation from reality. As such it would be empty and meaningless and besides would leave reality in a hopeless condition. It is in their unity that they give a basis for the knowledge of God.*

From what has been said about the relation of the ideal to reality, it is evident that we have not in the present world a complete manifestation of God, and a definition of God is in the nature of the case an impossibility. The so-called definitions of God always presuppose that God is a static being, a fixed sameness, whose nature you can, therefore, define by enumerating a number of attributes. This procedure leads at once into a whole nest of fallacies. While God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, he is always manifesting new aspects of himself, and none of these aspects contain the whole truth. The tendency of the intellect, however, is to lay hold on one of these phases of manifestation, and then to say: That is God. The savage sees God in the tree, and then he says the tree is God and henceforth proceeds to worship it. We call that idolatry. The civilized man forms his conception of God as he sees him in some partial manifestation at a

particular time or place, and then says: that is God, and that is *only* a refined sort of idolatry. God must be conceived in terms of process rather than being, in energistic rather than static terms. And if any one says: Lo, here, or, Lo there, as though here or there he had at last come upon God, so as to grasp him or hold him fast, believe it not. If you do, you will but gain an idol. The God of Israel is a living God; and if he is to be a living reality to us, we must find him every day anew in the vital religious experience of the heart. The heart makes the theologian.

But in order to realize fully the inadequacy of any intellectual conception of God, we must remember, not only that God is only partially manifested in reality as it is at any given moment, but also that this partial manifestation can not be adequately expressed in the ordinary categories of the understanding. The more scientific a science becomes, the less does it represent reality. The ideal science is mathematics, and every scientist tries to reduce his own science as far as possible to mathematical terms, and to take into consideration only quantitative relations. It thus becomes exact, but at the expense of telling us less and less about reality. This method has been extended even to psychology, and we now study psychology in the laboratory, by the help of all kinds of measuring instruments. But how little do such experiments tell us of the infinite fulness of our mental life! And in an infinitely higher sense is God more than the formulae to which theologians would reduce him.

"Our little systems have their day,  
They have their day and cease to be;  
They are but broken lights of thee,  
And thou, O, Lord, art more than they."

From this standpoint we can see the truth in Kant's assertion of the unknowableness of reality, and of the supremacy of faith over knowledge. But Kant pushes the truth to extremes; God and reality are, according to him, not merely inadequately known, but they are unknowable. Faith and

knowledge are separated from one another, and in this separation, both are in danger of perishing. At any rate to try to hedge in the realm of the divine, must prove a fruitless effort. You may erect a thousand walls against the intellect, and hang them full of prohibitory signs; the intellect will not be thus restrained, and will see in that all but a challenge to press boldly on into the forbidden precinct. The kind of faith that Kant and his theological followers propose is an impossibility. The intellect must form some kind of conception of God. And just because these conceptions are inadequate, it is necessary that they be clearly formulated, in order that their inadequacy be brought to light, and something more adequate be put in its place. Faith must seek to apprehend, and that ever more fully, and to express its convictions in definite conceptions. What we have wished to emphasize is, that such conceptions must not displace faith, and thus become a dead idol; and that the process of formulating the doctrine of God is not one of pure speculation, and not the task of the intellect alone; but that the intellect must place itself under the guidance of the heart, and ever fall back upon the richness and fulness of concrete experience.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

## V.

### THE EMMANUEL MOVEMENT.

FRANKLIN H. MOYER.

The human race has probably never been without some form of faith cure. In this age the terms mental healing, powwow-ing, divine healing, Christian science and others have become quite familiar to us. A very large number of persons claim to have been either benefited or cured from ailments by mental process or through faith. In recent years many have been attracted to these schools or cults. Christian science has been especially prosperous, having attracted a very large number of intelligent persons. Its doctrines and claims have been much ridiculed, but in spite of all this, its prosperity continues unabated. These schools and cults have abounded in error, and to many, some of their doctrines appear wellnigh ridiculous; but in this supposed rubbish-pile of the ages there has been discovered a treasure, the mind's power to influence the body. This is the central thought upon which the Emmanuel Movement rests. In some respects this movement resembles the faith cures of the past, in others it differs widely from them; it has the truth clearly stated, which they felt somehow rather than understood; but it lacks their error. It is thoroughly scientific, and in this respect it stands in direct contrast to its predecessors. The founders of the Emmanuel Movement, prepared by a thorough study of psychology, were among the first to clearly perceive the mind's power upon the body and use it in a practical and scientific way for the amelioration of human suffering. They had no preconceived plan, not even any intention, of practicing the art of healing by mental process on a large or even a small scale; but through the circumstances in which they found themselves, they were naturally led into it.

Drs. Worcester and McComb, rectors of Emmanuel Church, Boston, were moved to an effort to contribute to the anti-tuberculosis crusade. The tuberculosis patients of the poor classes in the slums of our large cities appealed very strongly to these men. It seemed impossible to move such patients to a more favorable climate or to a sanatorium for treatment, so they finally concluded in 1905 to organize a tuberculosis class in Emmanuel Church. They secured the services of a distinguished physician, who gave the members of the class medical treatments according to best scientific methods; this was supplemented by the church's work, which aimed at discipline, friendly encouragement, hope and faith. Thus, a combination of physical, psychical and moral elements were applied with splendid success. The International Tuberculosis Congress which met in Washington, D. C., awarded the leaders of this class the first gold medal for their successful and encouraging work. Some of the most eminent physicians and specialists on tuberculosis regard the results attained in this class one of the most hopeful things in the treatment of tuberculosis. Having met with this surprising success through their psychic and moral efforts in the tuberculosis class, it occurred to these men that similar treatment should succeed in cases of mental and nervous disorders. Accordingly in 1906 they started the Emmanuel Health Class under medical and clerical leadership, and here again much success crowned their efforts. This proved to be the beginning of what is to-day called the Emmanuel Movement.

The founders of this movement have always had a very high regard for the medical profession, for surgery, and for all material agencies which have been found useful in the art of healing. Any agencies whatsoever which have been found useful in healing diseases are God-given gifts by which *He* relieves and heals the sick and suffering. In addition to material agencies there are psychic and moral forces which are very valuable in healing diseases of a mental and nervous character. They are these classes of disorder that the Emmanuel method aims to restore.

When a patient applies at Emmanuel Church for treatment, he is first referred to a physician who makes a thorough diagnosis of the case. Should he find organic disease, he would not commend the patient to the church for treatment, the medical profession being regarded as most competent to treat the case. Should there be no organic but simply mental and nervous disorders, the patient would be handed over to the church for treatment.

The classes of patients left to the church for treatment are such as neurasthenics, psychasthenics, alcoholism, victims of morphine and of cocaine, the discouraged, the despondent, the sad. Some are sent by physicians, while others come of their own accord and of those that come, a very large percentage are intelligent persons from the various professions; even physicians are found in the list of applicants.

Before the patient can be successfully treated by the Emmanuel method, a second diagnosis of the case must be made. There is a great variety of mental and nervous disorders possible, and the exact nature of the trouble will have to be ascertained, and the causes leading to the trouble found. Each case will then be treated according to its own nature and needs.

There is, however, first, a general treatment for all the patients in the class, which is given at a weekly public service. This service consists of singing of hymns, the reading of Scripture, repetition in concert of the Apostle's Creed (requests for prayer are to be freely made), prayers are offered, and an address on some subject interesting and beneficial to the patients is made. The subjects usually treated are such as suggestion, worry, fear, grief, cheerfulness, hope, faith.

The special treatment varies according to the needs of the patient. In certain classes of cases the patient is seated in a reclining chair, he is made to relax his mind when suggestions are made with a view of dislodging unwholesome ideas and fixing wholesome ideas in his mind. The best results are obtained when the patient is heartily in sympathy with these efforts and most earnestly coöperates. In addition to this the

patient may practice autosuggestion. In some cases the most effective treatment is simply having the patient take a season of rest and recreation; in others *work* of the right kind and done in the right spirit and affording pleasure and satisfaction is invaluable in the restoration of health; which in still others the awakening of faith, courage and hope, and an optimistic view of things in general are chiefly needed.

The Emmanuel method has been unusually successful. A large percentage of cases treated have been entirely cured, a much larger percentage have been greatly benefited and a comparatively small percentage of cases have not been benefited at all. In view of the fact that only functional disorders are attempted to be treated, such results are to be naturally expected.

The Emmanuel Movement is not confined to Emmanuel Church, Boston. It soon found its way into other churches and health classes are now found in churches in large cities in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Still more significant is the fact that the principles of this movement are very widely accepted in this country and that they have found lodgment in every country in the world. In the medical schools to-day the subject is receiving serious attention and in our colleges and universities, professors of psychology are not only studying and teaching the principles of this movement, but by their experiments and research are making valuable contributions to it. The psychological principles underlying healing by the Emmanuel method are being diligently sought for. The scientific methods of this movement strongly tend to lift psychology out of the sphere of the speculative and make it look to practical ends, and psychology in turn is throwing a flood of light on Emmanuel healing, revealing its fundamental principles ever more clearly. Thus from many sources much valuable information regarding the nature of this movement and its great merits is obtained, all of which tends to commend it the more to the people.

We are looking forward to the time when the principles of



Emmanuel healing can be more accurately and minutely stated. The conviction is growing that the influence of mind on body and vice versa is great, but we have probably not yet learned fully to realize the extent of such power. We have as yet only a very general idea of it, and we have not yet been able to accurately formulate the laws by which it is governed. Many different things may act on the mind or on the body of man and not only cause changes but lead to serious mental and physical disorders. Some of these are quite easily perceived, others not. It is not difficult for us to perceive the effect of mechanical forces on the body or on the mind. A blow on the head may result in a bruise, or a wound, or in serious mental disorder. Bodily changes lead to mental changes. Body and mind are in close contact with each other. External objects affect the mind through the body. In the case of hearing, sound waves stimulate the sense organs and these stimulate the brain which results in hearing. Physical changes, however they be brought about, tend to affect the mind. When certain substances are taken into the body by eating or drinking, their elements are taken up into the blood, then they are carried to the brain and other parts of the body which they affect in some way. Changes in the brain especially will lead to mental changes. Drugs and alcoholic liquors severely affect the brain and nervous system and of course lead to mental changes. Any physical force or any substance received into the body that unfavorably affects the brain cells or the body tends to lead to functional or organic disorders and anything which will favorably affect the body and the brain cells or the body tends to lead to functional or organic disorders and anything which will favorably affect the body and the brain cells tends to restore such disorders and is conducive to good health.

We are quite familiar with the effects of material things and chemicals on the body and on the mind, but the effects of psychic forces on mind and body are not so easily perceived, and in many cases are much greater than has been suspected.

Changes caused by psychic forces are almost constantly going on within us, and such changes are confined not only to the mind but to the body and the brain cells as well. There is what is called a psychophysical parallelism. We cannot satisfactorily explain mental states unless we connect them with physical processes. All mental experiences are intimately related to the body. A mere thought affects brain and body and may result in motion. Thoughts often affect large portions of the body. They may make me blush when the blood-vessels of the face become dilated, they may result in loss of appetite when the stomach and glands become affected. Professor Anderson, of Yale University, is reported to have made scientific tests as to the possibility of bodily changes caused by mental action. He caused a young man to be suspended on a perfectly balanced disk. He was given a difficult mathematical problem to solve mentally. His efforts to solve the problem resulted in the upper part of his body suddenly becoming heavier. Another test was made by telling the young man to earnestly think of running with all possible speed. When he thought of this the lower part of his body became heavier and the disk tipped on the side where his feet were. The experiment revealed the fact that the center of gravity of this young man suspended, shifted as much as four inches according to the nature of the thoughts he entertained. All our thoughts and affections, our fears and disappointments, our hopes and desires are accompanied by bodily changes, and according to the intensity and frequency of such thoughts and emotions different parts of the body may be very severely affected. Mind is one of the mightiest powers we know and it may affect the body and the brain to a marked degree.

There are certain mental processes and ideas which, entertained for an extended period of time, will lead to serious disorders. Our thoughts and emotions are frequently responsible for the ruin of health. They so directly and strongly influence the functions of the various parts of the body that they may be classed in a sense with acids and poisons. We

are all subject to and frequently entertain fear; this emotion effects the body most unfavorably. In intense fear the muscles suddenly become convulsed or rigid, a deathlike pallor creeps over the features, the eyes start, the brain becomes excited, the large arteries distend, the heart swells, the blood suddenly leaves the extreme parts of the body, there is a tendency to faint, and it may lead to sudden death. Eminent surgeons report that patients about to undergo operations in hospitals have died of sheer fright before operations could be undertaken. And it makes little difference whether fear is awakened by actual or imaginary danger, the effect is all the same. Numerous other unfavorable effects follow from fear. There are cases on record where persons have been *frightened* into certain conditions and ailments. It is reliably reported that a woman had her gown bitten by a dog, she herself not having been even scratched, and she was greatly frightened. She had been familiar with a case of hydrophobia and instantly she was laboring under the conviction that she now had it, and what is still more surprising she actually suffered and finally died of symptoms so like those of hydrophobia that it was very difficult for a skilled physician to tell any difference.

It is true these are the results of fear in extreme cases, and while the immediate consequences of fear are not so dire in the great majority of cases, it is a fact, however, that in a less evident way, by slow processes, serious consequences have followed in many cases. The masses are possessed with fears of many kinds. From childhood up to old age, for all, there are constantly things which give rise to fears. The child instinctively entertains fears about many trivial matters, the business man entertains them about his business, about his ambition, and about an endless variety of things with which he is concerned. The society woman entertains fears about things in which she is greatly interested, and so the masses entertain many foolish fears which strongly tend to undermine health.

Another destructive emotion is worry. It is needless for me to say that this undermines health; it kills more so than

fear, but by slow processes. What a poison this is to mind and body. This has brought untold misery to the human race and dragged multitudes into untimely graves. It is not possible to trace the ruinous effects on the body of many similar undesirable emotions and mental states, but to those already mentioned should be added lust, inebriety, rudeness, selfishness, doubt, despair, hatred, disloyalty, anger, dishonesty, vanity, self-conceit, injustice and the like as widely prevalent and responsible in a large measure for human misery and for many psychical and physical disorders.

We are not able to describe the internal physical changes wrought by such emotions and mental states, but those just mentioned undoubtedly act like poison on the body. Professor Elmer Gates recently made numerous experiments trying to ascertain the effect on the body of such emotions and mental states. His tests revealed the fact that emotional and mental changes were accompanied by changes in the chemical character of the exhalation and of the perspiration, each emotion and each mental state producing its own peculiar effect upon the exhalation and upon the perspiration. Exhalation and perspiration in an *angry* person contained certain kind of poison. In the same person not long afterward when *frightened* they contained different kind of poison, and when he entertained *hatred* they contained still a different kind of poison and so on. These various poisons were injected into the veins of guinea pigs and of hens and it was found that the poisons resulting from some of the undesirable emotions and mental states killed them outright. Pleasant and wholesome emotions and mental states showed no such poisons in the exhalation or the perspiration.

Now if undesirable thoughts and emotions create poison in the body and if the opposite of these do not, it becomes evident that our thoughts and emotions have much to do with health and sickness. If those suffering from mental and nervous and in some cases physical disorders could be made to be *courageous, temperate, self-reliant, cheerful, and to exercise*

self-control and acquire the long list of wholesome, positive faculties and qualities, with the acquisition of these their disorders would in large measure vanish. The Emmanuel method seeks to awaken and perfect such faculties and qualities in the patient and this is done by the process of suggestion. Suggestion is the effort to entertain ideas in our own minds, or to cause others to entertain ideas which will suppress or exclude other ideas. Practically all people have the power of suggestion, though some have it to a larger degree than others; and nearly all people are open to and accept suggestions at some time and under favorable circumstances, but some accept suggestions more readily than others. Some are credulous while others are skeptical and are likely to resist, and between the credulous and the most stubborn there are many gradations. Environment and the condition of the patient have much to do with his suggestibility. The relaxation of the mind, the possession of hope, faith, desire, and expectation help to increase suggestibility. When any idea is suggested and the patient accepts it, such idea then tends to exclude from his mind all other ideas and especially opposite ideas. Suggestions are either of belief or of action and they become real and effective when the ideas are being believed or when they are being obeyed or acted upon. The Emmanuel treatment succeeds most readily with the patient that is easily suggestible, for he will unhesitatingly accept new and wholesome ideas and will easily be led to wholesome actions.

Hypnotism produces a much higher state of suggestibility than exists in the normal state. In the hypnotic state almost any idea will be accepted and even acted upon by the patient. The patient can be made to see almost anything that is suggested, even though it does not exist at all, or in the case of things confronting him, if the suggestion is made that nothing is there and that he sees nothing, he becomes unable to see anything. Likewise the patient can be made to act on almost any suggestion, however ridiculous such action may be. Moreover the ideas that are accepted in hypnotism are accompanied by

the usual physiological changes. If the patient is told that he is blushing, he will blush and the bloodvessels of the face will dilate and so the various suggestions in the hypnotic state lead to changes in the various parts of the body and the internal organs.

Now the Emmanuel treatment consists largely in offering to the patient, either in normal or hypnotic state, wholesome suggestions which will crowd out of his mind unwholesome ideas and emotions, suggestions which will tend to bring about desired psychic and physical changes. This method succeeds in the cases of purely functional disorders. In many mild cases similar results can be obtained by practicing autosuggestion. It is possible in this way for a person to change his very character. If a person has undesirable qualities of character, these may be blotted out and better ones awakened and perfected by the persistent practice of autosuggestion. For instance, the person who is impetuous and lacks self-control may, by suggesting to himself the possibility and the fact of self-control in his life, acquire this power. And so justice, industry, courage, perseverance, truthfulness, kindness, sympathy, and any other good qualities of character may not only be acquired but even perfected by the simple process of autosuggestion.

The power of suggestion can perhaps be best appreciated by observing the Emmanuel worker at his task. Dr. Worcester reports having treated a case which may be briefly stated as follows: A woman came to him who claimed, that, for fifty-five years, for four or five days per week, she had been suffering from an agonizing pain in her head. In diagnosing her case he came to the conclusion that her affliction was a kind of reverberation of an old pain—the perpetuation in memory and in imagination of a former condition, which no longer existed. She appeared even then to be greatly suffering. His treatment was as follows: Having seated her in a comfortable position, and having made her very quiet, he placed his hands on her head and assured her earnestly that her pain was diminish-

ing, that in ten minutes it would be gone, and that it would not return. The suggestion succeeded and there was no recurrence of the pain.

Dr. Münsterberg has treated many cases, among them being the following: A very intelligent young university professor became extremely nervous whenever he was in an assembly of people or whenever he met some one and whenever he was in any elevated place. He could hardly endure sitting in church or theater. In treating the patient he first hypnotized him. Then he earnestly suggested that as soon as he would be in a crowd of people he would feel unusually comfortable; that he would find much pleasure in associating with others; that when he would stand in any high place he would feel perfectly secure. After the third treatment he was able to enjoy going to the theater, and only when he was extremely fatigued about a year later did traces of his old trouble appear which trouble was then completely cured by two similar hypnotic treatments.

Dr. Münsterberg treated also this case: A man while out on the street walking suddenly found it impossible to move. This hesitancy or inability to walk came on very suddenly and unexpectedly, and he suffered from this trouble so vehemently that he could not venture to walk on the street any more. He was not able to say what had caused this trouble. Dr. Münsterberg inquired about his past life and after much questioning discovered that some years previously he had been running on the street, expecting to board a street car, when suddenly he came to a deep ditch into which he almost stumbled. This caused a great emotional shock which later led to his trouble. The patient was hypnotized and in that condition the suggestion was made that he was now running to catch the car and that right there was the ditch and that he would not hesitate but jump right over it. The patient jumped according to the suggestion. He went through this procedure unhesitatingly for ten successive treatments when the trouble had entirely disappeared.

Dr. Worcester treated children, breaking them of bad habits



by making suggestions to them in their natural sleep, and claims to have been successful especially in the cases of children with whom he was personally well acquainted. Many similar cures have been wrought which time will not permit me to mention here.

The Emmanuel Movement has been a church movement; it originated in the church and has so far progressed mainly in the church. The question arises, should the churches generally take up this work or should it be left to the medical profession?

The fact that it originated in the church does not prove that it naturally belongs there. Emmanuel healing is not any more religious in nature even though accomplished through the efforts of a clergyman, than any other cures wrought by any other therapeutic agent; and if it is not religious in nature, why should it be done by the church?

It is proper to say that this work should be done by the most competent persons. But who is the most competent? Is it the minister or the physician or is it some one else? At this time probably neither the average minister nor the average physician are at all competent to do this work. The fact of the matter is that to do it at all successfully there is required a most thorough course of instruction and training in psychology, which comparatively few ministers and less physicians have taken. If either the church or the medical profession are to do this work on a large scale they must by a special course of study prepare those entering these professions for this important work. And between the church and the medical profession the latter is pretty sure to offer such training soonest.

The minister is at a disadvantage too, in that he cannot diagnose a case from the start. Only the well trained physician can ascertain whether the patient has functional or organic disease. The church cannot get along in this work without the help of the medical profession, but the medical profession by adding psychotherapy to its present course of

study can easily do this work without depending upon the help of the church.

Emmanuel healing is fundamentally a psychical process. Should the church on a large scale enter into this work, there would be danger that it would be regarded as purely religious in nature. Besides, it would have a tendency to cheapen religion. It is not physical comfort that the church aims primarily to give, but something far more important.

There is perhaps no better reason for the minister to engage in Emmanuel work than there is for him to practice medicine in connection with his parish work. There are many therapeutic agents now freely used by the physician; the mind is simply another of these agents, which has been quite recently discovered as such; but the physician has not yet hastened to use it freely like many others. Perhaps the physician's lack of psychological training and the large amount of time required for treatments according to the Emmanuel method, have made him hesitate to use it. But while a few gifted clergymen, experts in psychology, have been leaders in the practice of psychotherapy, we believe that, in the very nature of things, not the church but the medical profession will be sure to follow that leadership. In spite of the fact that in the earliest periods of the church's history, the Apostles and their successors healed the sick, and even though there be a feeling on the part of some that it is the church that ought to do this work now, it is altogether probable that in this scientific age the healing art will be practiced distinctively by the specially trained physician and surgeon.

The fundamental principles underlying Emmanuel healing are the same as those underlying the healing of Christian Science and similar schools and cults and the more the influence of mind on body and of body on mind are understood, and the more accurately we are able to account for physical and psychical conditions and changes, the less the Emmanuel method of healing will be regarded as miraculous and as suitable only for the church to use; but the cures wrought by this

method will seem no less marvelous. The scientific accuracy with which this method proceeds will commend it more and more to the medical profession.

In recent years the great gifts of healing have been found not in the church as of old and the great miracles of healing of this age have been wrought not by the church but by the medical profession, and it is not likely that the church will acquire more competency than the medical profession even in the matter of Emmanuel healing.

But the church is naturally much interested in the Emmanuel method of healing, because it proves a blessing to many and is a public good. The church has the same interest in it that it has in medicines, or antitoxine, or anaesthetics, or hospitals, or sanitary regulations and similar things. It is eminently proper for the minister to encourage the use, by physician and patient alike, of the psychotherapeutic method. He should encourage its use as he does all else that is good. And while he may not conduct Emmanuel healing in his own parish he should heartily support such as may be capable of doing it.

Moreover the principles of the Emmanuel method are of great value to the minister in the discharge of his regular duties. In the educational work of the parish, in its social life, and in the pastoral work the principles of this method will be very valuable. One of the important tasks of the minister is to build or help to build Christian character among the people he serves and this has much to do with the happiness and health of the people. The truths of Christianity are wholesome not only for the soul but for the mind and body as well. Christian truths and the Christian life and character tend to build up the entire person. The church awakens and perfects the qualities of faith, hope, love, truthfulness, purity, and many others and with these come peace of mind and happiness and all this is conducive to physical well being. It is becoming evident that the more the principles of the Emmanuel Movement are being understood, the more precious

even for the body, the truths and character of Jesus are made to seem. While the medical profession endeavors very properly to heal diseases and while a comparatively small number of thoroughly competent men, either clergymen or physicians or both, will be likely to successfully practice the art of healing by the Emmanuel method, let the church recognize her great God-given mission, let her hear the pitiful cry of sinsick souls and preach the precious Gospel, which is abundantly able to restore all moral and spiritual disorders and incidentally contribute to physical well being.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

## VI.

### A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE MORALS OF THE APOSTOLIC AND OF THE MODERN CHRISTIAN CONGREGATIONS.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

In a study like this it is important to recognize the difficulties with which the student must contend. The objects of comparison are separated by eighteen centuries and by thousands of miles. They belong to diverse civilizations and different stages in the history of Christianity. It is harder also to estimate with precision the morals of a church than its doctrine, cultus and polity. The former must be traced in the disposition, conversation, and deeds of the members; the latter are clearly stated in creeds or formulated in ceremonies and laws. The sources from which the data must be drawn are too limited on the one hand for detailed investigation, and the territory too extensive and diffuse on the other for mastery and generalization. The most widely-read scholar can speak with authority on a comparatively limited portion of modern Christianity; and he will discuss with diffidence many localities and aspects of the ancient churches.

An historic view of primitive Christian conditions requires us to rid ourselves of the fiction of uniformity, under whose influence we have been accustomed to study the apostolic age. Since the third century historians of all schools have represented the early churches, from Jerusalem to Rome, as having had a uniform doctrine, worship, organization, and morality. The conception is the logical sequence of the theory that the apostles received by direct inspiration fixed forms of thought and life, which they delivered intact to all the churches of the empire. The facts, however, recorded in the writings of the time, tell a different story. The Christian communities in the

various sections of the Mediterranean world had all the latent differences that one finds in American Christianity. The doctrinal forms, the degrees of moral culture, the incipient erroneous tendencies varied according to the locality, leadership, and personnel of the congregations. Some were composed of Palestinian Jewish converts. In others the Jews of the dispersion were in the majority. In not a few the members came from the gentile world. The Pauline churches differed from the Petrine; the Johanine from both. Many congregations, indeed, were without immediate apostolic guidance because they were founded by obscure though faithful converts. The genius of the nations, also, gave form and color to church life. There were Oriental, Greek, and Roman types of Christianity in the first generations. "In Clement's letter to the Corinthians," says Dr. Harnack, "breathes the spirit of Rome; in the letter of Barnabas, that of Alexandria; and in the Ignatian epistles, that of the Orient." All these formative and differentiating factors and forces must be considered in a trustworthy description of the congregational life of the early Christians.

Keeping the limitations and difficulties of a treatment of the subject in mind, I shall attempt, first, a brief characterization of the conduct of the primitive congregations; and second, a comparison between them and the modern churches.

#### I. THE MORALS OF THE APOSTOLIC CONGREGATIONS.

The chronological limits of the apostolic period are the day of Pentecost and the death of the apostle John. The congregations, of which we have reliable information, were scattered in the lands north of the Mediterranean from Jerusalem to Rome. The center of the Jewish Christian propaganda was Jerusalem. The Pauline churches were naturally grouped as follows: The Syrian-Cilician, the Galatian, the Macedonian, the Achaian, the Phrygian, and the Roman. There were Christian communities beyond these borders but they have left no records behind. At the close of the century, in the churches of Asia

Minor, we find the Johannine spirit dominant, and the congregations generally entering the transitional stage toward Catholicism.

The ethical ideals of the New Testament writings cannot be taken as the measure of the actual moral condition of the Christians. For they, like the gentile, apostle, "had not already obtained," nor were they "already made perfect"; but "had to press toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Some were babes who had "need of milk"; some, full grown men "who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil" (Heb. 5:13-14). The ethical appropriation of spiritual blessings was a gradual process and not a sudden acquisition. Still the *ideals* which they cherished must be taken into account in a study of their moral status. For, in the words of Browning,

"What I aspired to be  
And was not, comforts me."

The source of Christian morality was the consciousness of a new relation of the individual to God in Christ. Religion is the mother of morality. Its ethical motivation, however, differentiates Christianity from every other system of religion and philosophy, whether Jew or Gentile, ancient or modern. While it is not our purpose to enumerate the points of difference, we may say in general that Christianity transcends other systems as Jesus transcends men and as the Gospel is superior to Jewish law, oriental mysticism, or Greek philosophy.

The apostles, accordingly, expounded religious facts before they presented ethical principles. The new relationship of the believer in Christ Jesus was defined by analogies, similes, and parables. The following are some of the designations of the Christians which were urged as ethical motives: "Children of God," "called to be Jesus Christ's," "called to be saints," "dead with Christ," "raised together with Christ," "bought with a price," "new creatures," "His workmanship in Christ Jesus," "children of Light," "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession"



"washed, sanctified, justified." The note struck in all of these terms is that of separation from the world or their former manner of life, and of consecration to God. Their citizenship was not in the world but in heaven. They were exhorted to become what in Christ Jesus they are. This continues to be the ethical paradox in Christianity. We are saved, yet we must work out our salvation. We are sanctified, yet we must keep ourselves pure.

The mission of the apostles and missionaries was not only *evangelization* but *edification*. They had to teach their converts the new way of life. This pastoral function Paul refers to in his first epistle to the Thessalonians (I Thes. 2:12): "As ye know how we dealt with each one of you, as a father with his own children, exhorting you and encouraging you, and testifying to the end that ye should walk worthily of God, who calleth you into his own kingdom and glory." When a Christian community was formed the apostles exhorted the members in a general way without reference to specific questions, acts, or transgressions. Examples of such admonitions are found in the epistles. "Walk worthily of God, who calleth you into his own kingdom and glory" (Thes. 2:12). "Cast off the works of darkness and let us put on the armor of light" (Rom. 13-12). "But be ye imitators of God, as beloved children, and walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself an offering for us" (Eph. 5:12). "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," 2 Tim. 2:19.

The immature Christians, however, could not always decide doubtful questions relating to conduct, which arose from time to time. They accordingly addressed letters of inquiry to the apostles, who wrote replies on the specific moral relations of life, and held up holiness and love as the cardinal attributes of a congregation.

Holiness required separation, not ceremonially but ethically, from contemporary Judaism and heathenism. The motives, the disposition, and the aims of the Christians were to be

different from, and superior to, the surrounding world. Both Jesus and the apostles laid stress on this point. "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). "This I say, therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye no longer walk as the Gentiles also walk, in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God" (Ephes. 4:17-19). "They are of the world. . . . We are of God" (I John 2:5, 6). The greatest snare, especially of the gentile converts, was a relapse into the lusts and license of heathenism. The virtues of chastity, sobriety, and temperance were therefore constantly reiterated, and the voice of warning was raised against all forms of sensuality. A single passage will serve as an example of many others. "Be not deceived: neither fornicators nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9-10). See, also Gal. 5:20-21, I Pet. 4:1, 2.

Christian love was to manifest itself in a high regard for all men, but especially for the brethren. "Let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10). Not only were they to love their friends, but their enemies also. "If thine enemy hunger feed him," etc. (Rom. 12:17). In the brotherhood they supported one another, visited the sick, sent alms to the poor, cared for the widows and orphans, and were hospitable even toward strangers. Their benevolence reached beyond the bounds of the congregation. With those who were not in the church they were to live at peace, and to deal honestly. "Be long suffering toward all." (I Thess. 5:14-16, Col. 3:12-15).

All the forms of social life are treated in the several epistles. The duties of wives to husbands, of husbands to wives, of children to parents, of slaves to masters, and of masters to servants, are summarized in well-known passages of Paul and

Peter. The relation of the Christian to the state is, also, defined. "Let every Soul be in subject to the higher powers" (Rom. 13:1). Each man was to continue in his occupation "wherein he is called." "Study to be quiet, do your own business, and work with your hands" (I Thes. 4:11). The inequalities of the world were lost sight of in the enjoyment of equality before God.

One cannot help but be impressed by the reasonableness, the poise, the moderation, and the conservatism of the apostolic teachings. In the leaders there is not a sign of fanaticism or of radicalism. They were not revolutionary, though in principle they contradicted the whole secular order. Nor can we maintain that these ideals were practically applied by all Christians. For the average life of the churches, then as now, fell short of the standards which were set up.

There are indeed instances of grievous immorality. Many of the converts professed faith but did not change their manner of living or, after a time, fell back into idolatry or vice. In the Corinthian church glaring defects were severely rebuked by the apostle. They had contentions which divided the flock into hostile parties. One of their members was guilty of "fornication as is not even among the gentiles." They profaned the Lord's Supper by selfish and excessive indulgence, so that some of them became "weak and sickly and not a few sleep." "Brother went to law with brother and that before unbelievers." They defrauded one another. In Jerusalem the Jewish Christians were charged with neglecting the widows of the Hellenists. Ananias and Saphira suffered a sad fate for their attempt to deceive the apostles. In the pastoral epistles we read of "some who turned aside after Satan" (I Tim. 5:14); of Demas "who forsook us. Having loved this present world" (II Tim. 4:1-10); and of Paul's loneliness in his trial at Rome, "At my first defense, no one took my part, but all forsook me" (II Tim. 4:16). Men were holding the "form of godliness, but had denied the power thereof" (II Tim. 3:5). In the seven letters of the Apocalypse the

lights and shadows of the Asiatic churches are painted. They have many praiseworthy qualities; but some of them are reprehended and admonished for various shortcomings. "I have this against thee; thou didst leave thy first love" (Revel. 2: 4). Again, "I have a few things against thee, because thou has there some that hold the teachings of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication" (Revela. 2: 14). "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead" (Rev. 3: 1). "Thou art neither cold nor hot" (Rev. 3: 15).

The moral immaturity of the Christians comes to light in the exhortations of the apostolic letters and in the controversies which disturbed the peace of the early churches. Paul prays that he "may perfect that which is lacking" in the faith of the Thessalonians. He urges them "to increase and abound in love toward all men" (I Thes. 3: 12). He assures the Philip-pians that "he who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ." Passages like these could be multiplied to show that the saints were still in the making and were far from perfection either in knowledge, in faith, or in love. Even the ethical teaching of apostles had its transient elements. Neither was Paul nor were his associates free from preconceptions of Judaism or of an inherited morality. Especially in the sphere of public life views appear which do not contain the principles of Christianity. Paul's theory of marriage, and the encouragement of celibacy, the disparagement of civil courts, submission to "the powers that be" resulting in indifference to social reforms may be considered questionable ethical standards for our age.

We find also that bitter controversies raged between the Judaizers and Paul, which threatened to rend in two the early church. It is an evidence of lack of understanding of the fundamental elements of the gospel, of instability in Paul's converts especially in Galatia, and of bitter enmities and jealousies between the followers of the same Lord. The gentile

churches were disturbed by the relations which they were to sustain to their heathen neighbors. A burning question was the legitimacy or illegitimacy of eating meat offered to idols. The congregations in Corinth and Rome were divided on this matter and Paul spoke of the *weaker* and the *stronger* brethren. There were tendencies toward sexual license and toward asceticism and celibacy. Both were unchristian and resulted from misinterpretations of the gospel. In Thessalonica a species of disorder followed in the wake of Paul's doctrine of the second advent. Some stopped working and became dependent on the community. A false estimate was put on poverty and alms. In other places the revolutionary spirit broke out. The civil and political order was set at naught and the authority of the Roman empire was denounced. Both the Jewish and the Christian apocalypses represent Rome as a demonic and hostile power. Paul, however, enjoins obedience to the powers that be; for they are of God. Christians are to pay tribute to whom tribute is due, to honor the king, and to lead quiet and peaceable lives.

To appreciate the actual moral condition of the early Christians, after a brief survey of their virtues and their vices, we shall have to compare it, not with the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount, nor with the Christian morality of to-day, but with the ethical status of surrounding heathenism. Of the latter we have vivid and revolting pictures from Paul and from the Roman philosophers, historians, and satirists. While the Augustan age was a classic period in literature and art, and men looked with contempt upon the barbarism of the fathers and of the uncivilized tribes of the North, still the empire was morally enervated and decadent. The temporary moral revival was only an autumn rose, which was trodden under foot by Teutonic hordes pushing across the Danube toward the eternal city. Into a world like this Christianity came. To illustrate by contrast we shall quote Tacitus' account of a feast given by Tigellinus (Annals, XV, 37-45). "For this purpose, he built, in the lake of Agrippa, a raft which sup-

ported the banquet, which was moved to and fro by other vessels drawing it after them: the vessels were striped with gold and ivory, and rowed by bands of pathics, who were ranged according to their age, and accomplished in the science of debauchery. He had procured fowl and venison from remote regions, with sea-fish even from the ocean: upon the margin of the lake were erected brothels, filled with the ladies of distinction: over against them naked harlots were exposed to view; now were beheld obscene gestures and motions; and as soon as darkness came on, all the neighboring groves and circumjacent dwellings resounded with music and glared with lights. Nero wallowed in all sorts of defilements, lawful and unlawful; and seemed to leave no atrocity which could add to his pollution, till a few days afterward, he married, as a woman, one of his contaminated band, name Pythagoras, with all the solemnity of wedlock; the Roman emperor put on the nuptial vail; the augurs, the portion, the bridal bed, the nuptial torches, were all seen; in fine everything exposed to view which, even in a family, is covered by the night."

This occurred a little while before a wandering preacher was thrown into a Roman dungeon. And while he was hourly expecting his execution he wrote to his friends in Philippi: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things" (Philip. 4: 8).

True the head of the Christian apostle fell at the word of the Roman Emperor. But need we ask why Paul conquered and Nero failed; why Rome died and the Kingdom of Christ lives. Its treasure and its power were the gospel of the pardoning grace of God. The churches were granted no civil protection; but they had courage to hold independent views of man's duty and destiny. They compromised neither with philosophy nor with other religions. The converts had to choose Christ or the world. Thus they received peace of

mind, a new vision of life, and a power which enabled them to transform visions into character.

The sincerity of the churches is revealed even by their faults. In many instances their controversies indicate a profound desire to live holy lives, though their zeal was without knowledge. They were quick in punishing apostates and transgressors. With a jealous eye they watched over the flock to guard the holiness of the church. Their liberality is clearly seen in the offering which Paul gathered in the churches for the Jerusalem Christians and in the aid which the Philippians sent three times to the apostle. Doubtless some fell from grace, but the number was by no means a majority; probably a comparatively small minority. On the contrary they suffered and died for their faith. When they were reviled, they reviled not again. They prayed for their enemies. They were exemplary citizens. It is astounding to see how the gospel in so short a time transformed a mixed assembly of Jews and Gentiles, of all social and moral grades, into a brotherhood which glorified God by a life of holiness and love. They had their defects. The spirit was willing but the flesh was weak. They aspired and often failed. Still they set their affections on the things that are above. To describe them as they were, without idealizing them, is the strongest testimony of the power of Christ and Him crucified.

## II. THE MORALS OF THE MODERN CONGREGATIONS.

In speaking of the modern congregation I shall confine myself to the American church and particularly to that part of it which has come under my personal observation either by direct contact or by trustworthy reports. It may be safe to assume that a section of the church, with its varieties and degrees of religious and moral developments, is an index of the Christian morality in general.

There is doubtless an element of truth in the statement that the seventeenth century was dogmatic; the eighteenth, philosophical; the nineteenth, historical; and that the twentieth is



ethical. Generalizations like these, however, are only partly true, yet they indicate the controlling tendencies of a period. The ethical revival of this generation is not confined to the churches, and some even doubt whether it originated in them. But they are in sympathy with it and co-operate in every good word and work. There are men and associations, filled with an enthusiasm for humanity and devoting their energies to the saving and betterment of men, who are not in affiliation with the church. Still it may be argued that the source even of humanitarianism is not so much a system of philosophy as the gospel which is working beyond the bounds of ecclesiastical organizations.

In comparing the two periods under discussion we shall point out the change and advancement in three directions. In the life of the primitive congregations the characteristic elements were: (1) Separation from the world, (2) the expectation of a speedy advent, (3) the sense of immediate and universal inspiration (the enthusiastic spirit). These doctrines no longer hold the same formative position in the modern churches. The feeling of difference between the Christian and the secular life is not so sharp now as it was then. The converts from heathenism and Judaism naturally felt more keenly the change from their former manner of life to the Christian life. Those who grow up in the congregation from infancy and have always been Christians, are inclined to minimize the difference between Christianity and the world. Then, too, in the course of nineteen centuries, the character of the world has been modified by the gospel, so that, in outward form at least, it is more like the church than it was in the days of Rome. The reverse, however, is also true. The church has conformed to the world and has lost in a measure the apostolic enthusiasm and ideals. Yet it is not a loss without compensation. Transformation of the world requires a measure of conformation to it. In this process many agencies are working for the Kingdom which are not directly under its control. "Some, indeed, preach Christ

even of envy and strife and some also of good will. What then? only in every way whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed: and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (Phil. 1: 15, 18). The primitive idea of the mission of the church was shaped by the separatistic spirit. The Christians' aim was not to redeem the world by pervading and changing its social order but to gather a group of persons from the present doomed and evil age. They did not, therefore, even when fitted to do so, enter the sphere of literary culture, of art, and of politics. Now the church strives for the conquest of the nations, in their civil, social and moral relations, for Christ and the Kingdom. This change of attitude we regard an evidence of a clearer comprehension of Christ's purpose and progress than was had in the apostolic communities. If it can maintain its ethical ideals and escape the attending dangers of secularization, the church is in a position to accomplish a far greater work than the primitive Christians could have done from their point of view.

The conception of the nature of the second advent has been changed from a cataclysmic, to a gradual, coming, from a specific judicial transaction to a moral process. True, the old doctrine is still found in the creeds and confessions, but it has ceased to have its original ethical significance. The transformed view of the present works doubtless for a more normal and balanced Christian life and a sounder and more efficient church activity. But as the old theory had to steer clear of the Scylla of fanaticism, so the new must avoid the Charybdis of moralism and indifference. Corresponding to the change in the view of the second advent is the passing of the sense of the immediacy of divine inspiration and its consequences—an unrestrained enthusiasm. In its stead we have systematic organization in government, worship, and the different forms of Christian activity. The sporadic has been superseded by the regular; the charismatic person by the officer; the prophet by the preacher and teacher. Is it a change for better or worse? When we think of the enlarged field of the church,

the greater demands made upon it, and the change of view as to its mission in the world, we believe, again, that the gain outweighs the loss, and that the modern congregation is far better equipped for the accomplishment of its divinely ordered work than the ancient.

The benevolent spirit of the present lacks the personal element which was so prominent in the early communities. They were actual brotherhoods. They met, for a while daily and then weekly, in their love feasts. Social distinctions were forgotten. They showed liberal hospitality. Now the work of benevolence is so highly organized that the individual drops his money into the box and in some unknown way it reaches the poor, the sick, the orphans, the school, the mission. This may be a necessary form of activity due to the size of congregations and the scope of the work. We can do much by organized charity, but we need to do more by personal contact with men and women who are the recipients of our bounty. We ought to give them more than money—our appreciation. We fail to receive what is worth more than our gifts—a benevolent disposition.

The church service, including the Lord's Supper, as it is now conducted, has far less of the personal and social in it than it had in the first century. The church lost a valuable aid for the development of its social life, when the agape was given up and the eucharist was transformed into the Mass or into a holy mystery in which the original fellowship of the brethren is largely ignored. We have turned the love feast into ice cream festivals with tickets of admission and the Lord's Supper into an unsocial and mysterious transaction. There has doubtless been a loss; and yet under new conditions and in a later stage of development these changes had to come. The old love feast, as we saw in Corinth, was not without its abuse; the new Lord's Supper has been a powerful influence for holiness and righteousness in the modern age, though some phases of its original purpose have been neglected.

The Christian home of to-day appears to be deficient in

definite religious acts and instruction. We do not underestimate the influence of the Christian ideal in general in the family, but the pristine religious conversation, the house churches, the indifference to the honors and the wealth of the world which were found in the apostolic congregation, seem to be wanting in our domestic life. Even in heathen lands religious ceremonies were, and still are, more closely interwoven with the domestic, social, and industrial life than in modern Christianity. Since church and state have been separated, and the industrialism of the nineteenth century has become dominant, we are inclined to relegate the distinctively Christian services—Bible study, prayer, preaching, child training—to the church and evade them in the home. Once religion was men's business; now business is men's religion.

In politics and business Christians are far more interested than were the early saints. They were faithful citizens, but the burdens of government did not rest upon them in a monarchy as they do upon us in a democracy. Then the Christian was only an obedient subject; now he enjoys the prerogatives of kingship and is responsible for the laws of the nation. While there are many who do not seem to vote as they pray, there is nevertheless a strongly ethical tendency in our modern politics which is supported by Christian statesmen. Men like Colonel Roosevelt, President Taft, Governor Hughes, and Mr. Bryan appeal to the moral nature of the American people for the solution of national questions. This augurs well for the future. There is a growing sense of responsibility in our churches for the well being of the nation and the attainment of righteousness and equity in all our social relations. The conditions, in this regard, are so different from those of the first century that a comparison is practically impossible.

When we take a bird's-eye view of the churches and consider the fidelity of the Christian ministry, the earnestness of the great mass of laymen, the consecration of enormous energy and wealth to Christian uses, the men and women who are denying

themselves the comforts of this world for service in Christ's Kingdom in lands beyond the sea and in our own borders, the loyalty to Christ in adversity and prosperity, the vast movements that are planned for the conquests of humanity for Jesus, the quiet and undemonstrative godliness that neither newspapers nor books can record; then we feel convinced that, with all its defects, the modern congregation is not inferior to the Apostolic. It is different from it indeed, but the difference does not necessarily mean retrogression. The missionary activity of the nineteenth century bears comparison with the first. The benevolence is proportionately as large, if not larger. The men and women who would die for their faith, if put to the test, are as numerous in Pennsylvania as they were in Asia Minor. But while we are equal, and in some respects superior, to the apostolic Christians, we are still striving to attain the Apostolic ideal. It has never been fully realized. We shall not go back to the first congregations and imitate them, but forward to the apostolic goal. Beyond it man cannot go. But to attain it, he needs the vision of God, the patience of the saints, and an eternity of time.

LANCASTER, PA.

## VII.

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OR THE CHANGED EMPHASIS IN EDUCATIONAL RELIGION.<sup>1</sup>

EDWARD S. BROMER.

Educational religion is a term that has been more or less of a denominational shibboleth with us. There is implied in the limiting word "educational" that there are other forms of religion in contrast with which so-called educational religion may be discussed. Two such forms at once stand out prominently: institutional or ecclesiastical and revivalistic or mystical religion. As a denomination growing out of the original impulse of the Reformation of the sixteenth century we would contrast our religion with Catholicism and emphasize the biblical and prophetic or educational view over against the ecclesiastical and institutional or priestly view. Looking forward and using the term educational religion, in the light of our modern American experience the other form of religion suggested is the rivalistic or mystical. This is the contrast that is most familiar to us.

It may be frankly stated that the influence of psychology and the historical spirit both in the study of the Bible and the Church have made it very evident that we ought to revise the statement of our subject. Christian training or religious education and the revival are both methods of converting men. To be sure the modern idea of revivalism is changed very much as contrasted with the one current a hundred years ago, but so also is the modern idea of educational religion vastly changed. Quoting, we might here say—"That the aim of

<sup>1</sup> With slight changes, this article is the same as an address delivered on the subject "Educational Religion" at the meeting of Pittsburg Synod, held at Myersdale, Pa., in October, 1909.

religious education is never mere knowledge or learning but to bring the individual into life—the largest, richest, highest life: and that life it conceives to be the sharing of the life of God—his character and joy.” The aim of the revival method is not an emotional ecstasy but the quickening of life and the leading into life even the same as the educational method seeks. The voluntaristic trend in psychology and philosophy or the emphasis of the will justifies the modern revival method in the effort at reaching the many thousands of adults who are out of Christ. The educational without the evangelistic results in intellectual formality and deadness; the revivalistic without the educational ends is empty sentimentalism. Today the Methodist Church stands in the front rank in applying the educational method to the Sunday-school, the Probationer’s Class and Missions. The Presbyterians and Reformed are moving rapidly toward a more evangelical emphasis though relaxing none in their educational spirit and claims. In the light, therefore, of a psychological study of man and of a historical study of the Bible, the church, dogma and society it is more to the point to speak of religious education than educational religion.

It is evident today that three great types of Christian expression have been preserved and are recognized as dominant. They are the very ones referred to a moment ago, viz., the institutional, or ecclesiastical culminating in the priestly mediatorial functions, and the Church as an infallible institution; the prophetic, or educational, basing itself in the Bible and requiring the educational method; the mystical or intuitional, claiming immediate consciousness of God and expressed in the revivalistic methods: Catholicism, Reformation-Protestantism, and modern Methodism with its allied types. All three are essential to a true sense of the completeness of Christianity in its hold on human life. The Church, the Bible and Christian experience are inseparable. To realize their relation alone assures their efficiency and points the way, with prophetic signs, to the coming reunion of Chris-



tendom. Is it not true that the dominant denominations of Christianity are seeking this ideal, which recognizes in the unity of life and practical work the true relation of the Church, the Bible and Christian experience?

But let us not digress. In stating the subject as religious education instead of educational religion, we put ourselves in opposition to no one, neither the Catholic nor the Methodist. It is very evident, however, that each of these three would reveal its own denominational equation and bias in treating the subject, religious education. It is the real strength of our denomination that we have always emphasized educational religion. We find ourselves in spirit and method in easy touch with the great educational trend of our age.

To be sure the subject, religious education, is too broad for the limits of this article. At once a whole group of topics suggest themselves, such as—The Changed Emphasis in Religious Education; The Scope of Religious Education; Religious Education as conditioned by Psychology; Religious Education as conditioned by Historical Study; Relation of Religious Education to the Home; to Catechetical Instruction; to the Sabbath School; to Missions; to Daily Work and Vocation; to Social and Political Life, etc.

The topic to which we are here led is the Changed Emphasis in Religious Education.

### I. THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

It is unnecessary to consume any time before a characteristic Reformed constituency to emphasize the importance of religious education. It is, however, necessary for us to remember that our customary conception of educational religion needs adjustment and enlargement in order, in these days, to meet the requirements of a genuine religious education.

### II. THE FORMER PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC EMPHASIS.

To get at the point of view which became dominant in the post-Reformation period allow me to quote the fundamental

position taken by Cardinal Newman in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, or as he states it, *The History of my Religious Opinions*. He says: "I have spoken of my firm confidence in my position, and let me state more definitely what the position was I took up, and the propositions about which I was so confident. These were three: (1) First was the Principle of Dogma; my battle was with liberalism: by liberalism I mean the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments. This was the first point on which I was certain. . . . I have changed in many things, in this I have not. From the age of fifteen, dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion: I know no other religion: I cannot enter into the idea of any other sort of religion: religion as a mere sentiment is to me a form and a mockery. (2) Secondly I was confident in the truth of a certain definite religious teaching, based on this foundation of dogma, viz., that there was a visible Church, with sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace. (3) And further, as to the Episcopal System, I found it upon the Epistle of Saint Ignatius, which inculcated it in many ways." We note in this statement of Cardinal Newman's that when the principle of dogma is once accepted the principle of universality and catholicity must also be adopted. The claim for an infallible standard either in the Church or the Bible demands in the one case an infallible Pope, and in the other, an infallible council of interpretation. With the Catholic the supreme dogma was the dogma of the Church. The one great demand made of the believer was submission and obedience. Now, naturally, the Catholics emphasized educational religion. In England the Oxford Movement, in the past century, which was a reaction against the excesses of the French Revolution and the new evolutionary sciences on the one side and the Wesleyan Methodist Movement on the other, made the effort at building up an educational system from the universities downward into society through the public schools controlled throughout by the Established Church in the name of the state. Protestantism in general reflected such a specialized effort at

educational religion. Our denomination made strenuous claims over against the pietistic and mystical Wesleyan tendencies in a similar manner. The real nerve of the so-called educational movement was the nerve of dogma and the necessity of indoctrinating children and adults as well, in order that they might be safe, intelligent and reasonable believers, ever being ready in intellectual statements to give a reason for the faith that was in them.

### III. THE CHANGED EMPHASIS.

It may be true that we still claim the dogmatic emphasis, but it cannot be doubted that there is a decided change in the emphasis. And when we begin to study the problem of religious education in general we at once perceive that the change of emphasis is very decided. The causes of the change are many. Each of them would be a most interesting topic for discussion. For example, the influence of psychology on religious education is one of the most notable factors in our modern thinking. The application of the historical spirit to the study of the Bible, the Church, dogma and society has also vitally changed our point of view. Perhaps the rise of democracy and the study of sociology growing out of it has as much to do with our changed emphasis in religious education as anything. Besides this, what is known as the practical or voluntaristic tendency in modern psychology and philosophy has had a large share in effecting the same change. This tendency is summed up in the word pragmatism, which has been so prominently discussed in these latter days. Our purpose, of course, cannot be to discuss any one of these in particular. We wish, however, to make clear a few practical things with reference to the larger ideas of religious education which we are endeavoring in our Sunday-school and Church work and preaching to inculcate into the minds of the people. In order to do this let us turn to the next step in our discussion.

## IV. POINTS OF EMPHASIS.

There are a number of special points of emphasis. I have selected three. (1) The Principle of Growth. (2) The Principle of Personal Association. (3) The Principle of Individual and Social Activity.

Perhaps no single word has dominated modern thought as much as the word "growth" or its synonyms "development" and "evolution." There are two forces that particularly brought this idea into prominence as far as we are concerned with it in this discussion of religious education. The first is the application of the historical spirit to the study of the Bible, the Church and Dogma. The second is the direct influence of the biological and psychological study of man and society on our ideas of religion and religious experience. In summing up this influence we may say that the conception of growth in the history of religion, of the Bible, of Dogma and of the Church, has certainly been revolutionary and has changed our general point of view very much. As a rule the world, mankind, religion and the Bible all make the impression upon the untrained mind of being ready-formed and complete at the moment of observation. There is no suggestion apparently as to the long process by which the present state has been reached. Nowadays, however, no one who feels and responds to the spirit of our age can fail to see how that in each of these departments it has been a long-continued process of growth and development which has given to us the present-day situation. In none of these fields of human activity and thought is the conception of an unchanged and unchangeable deposit of truth adequate.

So also with reference to the individual and the race. The view of man as a developing and maturing being is essentially new. Before the nineteenth century there were no books to be found on the study of the evolution of society. Sociology is a product of the modern mind working out modern democratic conditions. In thinking of the development of the child from childhood to adolescence onward into youth and old

age we necessarily must think of a succession of religious expressions and experiences. The effect this has had upon our idea of religious education is very manifest. Professor Dewey makes this significant statement: "The habit of basing religious instruction upon a formulated statement of the doctrines and beliefs of the Church is a typical instance. Once admit the rightfulness of the standard, and it follows without argument, since a Catechism represents the wisdom and truth of the adult mind, the proper course is to give to the child at once the benefit of such adult experience. The only logical change is a possible reduction in size—a shorter catechism and some concessions—not a great many—in the language used." This he declares a gross violation of the laws of child nature. He further says: "In a word, it is a question of bringing the child to appreciate the truly religious aspects of his own growing life, not only in inoculating him externally with beliefs and experiences which adults happen to have found serviceable to themselves." In other words—this principle of growth demands that religious truth and life be adapted to the various stages of development in the experience of the individual. It is at once evident how this has changed our idea of catechetical instruction and also our former conception of uniform Sunday-school lessons. The day has come when the graded school becomes a necessity. The adaptation of historical facts, religious truths and experience to the various stages of development in the life of the individual must be made and the sooner the better.

There are many dangers involved in forcing upon the young mind the adult religious experience in sin, repentance, forgiveness, etc. To do so often means to forestall deeper future experiences. It tends to make the child over-familiar with experiences and expressions which it does not understand. The consequence is frequently irreverence and finally scepticism when the child begins to think for himself.

Two conclusions are inevitable. First, the form of expression of Christian truth and second, the arrangement of it must be changed on the basis of the principle of growth.

*2. Personal Incarnation and Association.*

One of the direct results of the renewed study of man both from the point of view of biology and psychology is the renewed emphasis of personality. At first it was feared that the doctrine of evolution would degrade man to the level of the beast, but the outcome of it all has been the full and free enthronement of man as the head and climax of creation. Personality in all that it involves is the highest form of vitality and activity known to our experience. It is but natural that the direct influence of both biology and psychology would be a renewed emphasis of the sacredness of personality. For us as believers in the Gospel it has enhanced anew the uniqueness and supremacy of the personality of Jesus Christ, as the highest expression of the cosmic, human and God consciousness.

Christianity is indeed a doctrine but it is also a life. It is doubtless necessary that religion should clothe itself in concrete form, that it should transmit itself in concepts and words; but these words and conceptions have no validity until they become incarnated in actual life. Sabatier has well said: "The true religious propaganda is accomplished by moral contact. Out of life, life is born." Christianity thus is a truth to be explained; it is a way to walk in, a practical ethical progress toward an organized goal; but it is also a life, a vital, quivering, ever-present life. Its ideal of truth culminates in a living incarnation. "The word was made flesh." It comes to a climax in a living person. Lobstein in his "Introduction to Dogmatics" makes this significant statement: "To apprehend and develop a doctrine, the intellect, the memory, the faculty of exposition and speech, the natural gifts of man may suffice; to be a Christian, to have part in the Kingdom of God, one must be born from above. He must be animated by the Holy Spirit, he must belong to Christ." In other words, Christianity is a life.

On the basis of such a conception psychology and sociology have emphasized the absolute need of personal association.

The child must have society. Boys and girls must have fellowship. Adult life is barren when man becomes the hermit of the woods. And certainly this has a supreme significance with reference to religious education. The moral and spiritual awakening of the soul of the child must come largely through personal contact with some one to whom the religious life is a fact and has become vital by vivid experience. Who of us does not remember the spiritual father and mother of his Christian experience—that Sunday-school teacher, that faithful mother or father, that personal friend, that devoted pastor who first led him to the fountain consciously to drink for himself and made him feel his first-hand relation to God? Such association should be made one of the chief aims in religious education. The social fellowship of believers is essential to their life.

Not only should there be such personal association in public services, committees, prayermeetings and social gatherings, but it ought to be a definite aim, in the mind of teachers and leaders and fathers and mothers, to bear testimony to the noble characters in Bible History and of the Church and of life at large; so that, from the religious point of view, children may be made to feel more and more the strength and the power of the great ones that have lived before us. Now in this there is, of course, really nothing new but we are simply emphasizing one of the things that is being brought home to us in renewed clearness from our modern point of view and which will most surely have a marked effect on the coming generation. On this basis we have one of the most fundamental methods of propagating the faith. Browning, the great poet of personality, has clearly stated it in "Luria" in speaking of the master-minds as those

"Who have brought fresh stuff  
For us to mould, interpret and prove right,—  
New feelings fresh from God, . . .  
Whose life re-teaches us what life should be,  
What faith is, loyalty and simpleness."

. . . . .



Farther on in the same poem he adds:

"A people is but the attempt of many  
To rise to the completer life of one:  
And those who live as models for the mass  
Are singly of more value than they all."

Religious education, consequently, must place increasing emphasis on personality and the social community. The absolute significance of Jesus Christ for the individual and social life must receive a vital, ethical as well as a dogmatic expression. The living believers and the living, socialized community become dominant factors in religious education. All this puts most striking emphasis on the preëminence of Christ; the personality of the preacher, Sunday-school teacher and parents; the church services; and the socialized expression of the Christian spirit in all forms of practical life.

### 3. *Activity.*

Another psychological principle of importance and consequence with reference to the changed emphasis in religious education is "That which does not express itself dies." In other words, activity is the law of life. The laboratory work in the study of mind and experimental psychology in general has clearly emphasized the fact that the stream of consciousness is ever active both in the sleeping and waking hours. The physical, the mental and the spiritual life of the individual must constantly come to expression and realization in order that growth become possible. As soon as any organ is cut off from such expression it seems to wither and pass away. This principle as applied to modern education has developed what may be called the experimental or laboratory method in almost every department of study. The child must learn by thinking, by saying and by doing things. His own real self-activity must be developed.

"To know  
Rather consists in opening out a way  
Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape,  
Than effecting entry for a light  
Supposed to be without."

It is not any different in the religious conception of things. The outgoing life or activity and self-control in activity are a necessity of true development. Goethe, in speaking of the rapid spread of knowledge, once said, "Everything that sets free our intelligence without giving self-control is fatal." True education must ultimate in real moral being and effective, active self-control. How vital this truth becomes from the point of view of Christian experience. "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." "Out of the heart are the issues of life." "By their fruits ye shall know them."

In the broadest sense definite, systematic, regular work which forces the boy or girl to express himself or herself has religious value. A common daily task has much to do with religious development. Play in childhood as the child's vocation is one of the most important factors in its true development.

In the beginners, the primary and junior departments of the Sunday-school it is possible to bring this idea of personal activity into vogue and make the child express itself in learning some of the simpler truths of the Christian life. This tendency is to be encouraged as much as possible. During the adolescent period of boyhood and girlhood, the ideals of life in its heroic elements and its appeal to the imagination, should be emphasized, aiming to show the necessity of making a personal choice of the Christian ideal and beginning a career with the full and express purpose of making it a reality and working it out in common every day living. Very early in the experience of young people the conception of an unselfish service of others should likewise be made clear. Indeed, this psychological principle of personal activity is at one with the whole idea of the Gospel which sets forth life so predominantly as love and service.

It would be easy here, if it were within our scope, to illustrate how this principle of personal activity might work itself out in the prayer meeting and Bible study, in the various

committees of young people's organizations, mission study, etc.

And as life develops to the adult stage, one of the great impressions that should be made, in the religious point of view, is that the law of love and service is supreme in life. For Christianity to have its proper social influence upon the world, and the church to enter sympathetically into the problem of labor and capital and the industrial struggle for freedom in general, it certainly is necessary that this side of the Christian experience should be supreme in the mind of all believers. Until we come to the conception of a general social service that will see the good of all as the goal of society we certainly have not come to Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. Government of the people, by the people and for the people is but a small part of the Christian ideal. Industry and commerce and trade and business all must finally come under the sway of the law of love: so that the riches of nature increased by the riches of man's inventive skill and ingenuity and toil may likewise be of the people, by the people and for the people and not for the aggrandizement of the few. This point of contact of religion with life is undoubtedly the great emphasis of present day religious education. It is here that in the educational function of preaching to the adult minds of our age that great stress should be laid.

There is one point that needs to be emphasized under the idea of "expressive activity" which is frequently overlooked. I refer to the dogmatic social expression of the Christian life and community. There has been a tendency to decry dogma. We join in the cry when it means the Catholic conception of uniformity and authority and infallibility, but we deprecate it when it means that Protestant Christianity needs not to express itself with reference to its clearest religious convictions and teachings.

After all when you come to look at the principle of growth, of association and activity, they are formal principles without content until you put into them the vital content of human life with all its aspirations. And surely from the point of

view of a Christian religious education, we must get to the point where we clearly see that the formal principles of psychology and sociology are only like a mill running constantly, indeed, but without any grist. We must put the material content into the formal principles. The Christian community must express itself with reference to its thinking as well as its doing. A dogmatic expression is the desideratum of the day. Professor Dewey's words are strikingly significant. "Psychology has no peculiar gospel or revelation of its own to deliver." So likewise, has Professor Hugh Mackintosh expressed himself recently in the *American Journal of Theology*. "Let us remember what the psychology of religion is. Its function may be described in a few words. First, in abstraction from the time process, we simply analyze the contents of the religious consciousness; next, we inquire whether the religious psychosis is a primary or secondary element, an original and distinct kind of mentality—as logical thought is, or ethical judgment, or æsthetic intuition—or on the other hand a mere combination, a derived and collateral product born of the consilience of ideas and feelings not themselves religious. Further than this the scope of psychology does not extend. It is to be noted, therefore, that in the first place a psychological history of religion is incompetent to pronounce upon the truth of the beliefs it encounters in the human documents and records of the past." That is to say that a psychological history of religion has nothing to say about the objective veracity of the truths believed. Thus Professor Dewey speaks with reference to the psychological study of the present religious consciousness of the individual and Professor Mackintosh speaks of the psychological history of religion as a community life, both confessing that neither psychology nor the psychological historical tendencies can give us the vital content of religious truth or revelation. The content is life itself. The content of the Christian religion is rooted in the historical Jesus, risen and glorified and the consequent religious experience and life in and through him.

In the development of the modern educational spirit and work of the church there is, therefore, nothing of which we feel so much in need as a clear statement of this content and for that very reason we are entering into a period of doctrinal expression. Our deepest convictions in the light of all that is common to us in the name of science and modern experience must find a definite Christian expression. The historical method of the study of the Bible, of dogma, of the church and of society at large demands that we so express ourselves. As a background of all, there is this sense of the real general doctrinal basis of our faith. It is true that in our idea of things we have laid aside the legal side of Catholic and Protestant dogma with its claims of infallibility. But the expression of the Christian consciousness in its peculiar life and power and authority we have not laid aside. The scientific elaboration of our religious convictions is one of the peculiar functions of our organized church life; for, such dogmatic expression nourishes the Church's intellectual life, adjusts it to its world-view, meets its adversaries and formulates its pedagogic principles and propaganda. The Christian community, the cultivated life of the Church, cannot give an account of itself or understand the abundant riches inherent in itself or continue as a self propagating community and dispense with the scientific formulation of its religious convictions which bind its members in unity and love. To fail to formulate this conviction would depreciate and obscure the revealed redemptive facts which form the objective and historical part of the Christian religion. Cloudy mysticism would assail us on one side and gloomy scepticism on the other.

The strong tendency toward the inner, subjective side of life and experience has run in many minds into the so-called new thought, rationalism and spiritualism; and, in many more, into a type of Oriental mysticism so manifest in Christian Science and the various other faith-healing cults of our day. The objective historical side of the Gospel needs renewed statement in the light of modern science and historical research. The

historical Jesus, his life, teaching, person and redemptive work need to be impressed upon the religious consciousness of our age. The history of the Christian Church must be understood in the same spirit and the actual present life of the Christian community realized. The educational emphasis, consequently, will more and more be placed on the historical, objective, redemptive facts of the life of Jesus Christ during his sojourn on earth and their operative influence ever since throughout the Christian centuries. And it will once again be believed with definiteness of conviction that the incarnation and atonement of Jesus Christ are inseparable and that it is true today, as ever, that God in Christ is reconciling the world to Himself.

The educational spirit is following the trend of our age. We have tried to indicate the change of emphasis in religious education in particular. Formerly it was largely the principle of dogma that informed and directed and inspired religious education. Today, the demands of the complexity of life and the unity of man's nature must be recognized. Along with, correcting and completing the dogmatic principle, we recognize those of growth, association and activity; or, in other words, the dogmatic principle is supplemented by the evolutionary, the sociological and the ethical principles. That is to say, the whole being of man is taken into consideration. The religious element is not a thing separate from the physical, intellectual and moral life of man, but permeates his whole being and entire existence.

In a summary way, describing the religious educational tendencies in a somewhat different manner, we may say, using the language of Professor Coe, "First, the Christian life is simplified. Second, its ideals are being socialized. Third, its motives are being intensified."

Nor is it strange to us as Christian believers, that no less than the principle of dogma, do the scientific principle of growth, the sociological principle of association and the ethical principle of activity, lead to Jesus Christ. Growth and evolution in creation culminate in personality and personality

means consciousness of self, the world and God. And where else is all this supreme, than in Jesus Christ, the Son of God? Association, personal fellowship, social democracy all culminate in brotherhood. And where do we find the idealism of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man in purer form than in the Kingdom of God according to Jesus Christ? Activity, practical life, growing self-realization in positive living and triumph over sin both as immaturity and transgression involving guilt, and living in the hope of immortality—surely these find nowhere such confirmation and assertion as in the redemptive and inspirational work of Jesus Christ as the Redeemer and Life-giver. Instinctively we cry out to Him:—

“Yea, thou art still the life; thou art the way,  
The holiest known: Truth, Life and Way of Heaven.  
And they who dearest hope and deepest pray  
Toil by the truth, life, and way that thou hast given.”

GREENSBURG, PA.



---

## VIII.

### IN MEMORIAM.

JOSEPH HENRY DUBBS, D.D., LL.D., Audenried Professor of History and Archæology in Franklin and Marshall College, son of Rev. Joseph S. Dubbs, D.D., and his wife Eleanor; born in North Whitehall, near Allentown, Pa., October 5, 1838; died at Lancaster, Pa., April 1, 1910.

JOHN BRAINERD KIEFFER, Ph.D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Franklin and Marshall College; son of Rev. Ephraim Kieffer and his wife Eleanor; born at Bellefonte, Pa., October 20, 1839; died at Lancaster, July 10, 1910.

It is not often that an institution of learning or a college community experiences a double bereavement such as has come to Franklin and Marshall College and the affiliated institutions in the death, within so brief a period, of the two professors named above, eminent alike as scholars and teachers, and filling so large and important a place in the working force of the college and in the hearts of their colleagues, the student body, and the community. It goes without saying that this unusual affliction has made a profound impression, and the sense of loss on the part of all who came in touch with the departed is deep and abiding. Dr. Dubbs's death was not altogether unexpected, because his health during the past few years was seriously impaired. Dr. Kieffer was sick only a few days, and the news of his death, therefore, came as a great shock. In both cases, however, it was felt that the college and the community had suffered a great loss because of the personal worth of the two men and the important positions which they had so ably filled.

Psychologists tell us that a musical tone is usually the result of a complex impression made by a series of tones in harmonic relation that are sounded together. The characteristic quality

of voice or instrument by which one is distinguished from another depends on the partial tones or overtones which enter into the complex whole—a whole which is apprehended as a unit, and yet is capable of analysis by means of which the different constituents can be distinguished. The same pitch may be struck by a number of different voices or by very diverse instruments, but the effect in each case may be richer or poorer according to the number and kind of overtones present. The same principle applies analogically to a body of men organized into a faculty or an institution of learning. There is a total impression, a composite influence, a pervasive life and spirit which may be said to be the joint product of all the coöperating factors, the quality of which depends on these factors themselves or their respective contributions to the whole. Institutions as such have a continuous life. Faculties are constant and abiding. But the persons constituting them come and go, and with every change there is a twofold effect. There is a sense of loss because the individual is missed as an individual; but there is also a difference in the *complex tone* which constitutes what we have called the pervasive life and spirit of the whole. Tennyson's book sings:

I "draw them all along and flow  
To join the brimming river,  
For men may come and men may go,  
But I go on forever."

So organizations and institutions go on; but there is a difference. And when, as in this case, those who have dropped out of the ranks of the workers have borne so large and honorable a part in their specific activity, the difference will be keenly felt. Drs. Dubbs and Kieffer will be missed, therefore, because of their individual worth; but they will be missed also as a part of the composite life of Franklin and Marshall College, and of the social, literary, and religious activities with which they were associated.

The two men, very different in disposition and personal characteristics, had, after all, many traits in common. They

possessed natural endowments of a high order; they were industrious and enthusiastic students; their lives were enriched by their early environment and home training; and in their formal education they came, in early life, under the influence of teachers who inspired enthusiasm and enforced habits of study which moulded all their subsequent life. In their special departments they were recognized authorities, and their scholarship was never called in question, a fact which gave them standing and weight in the class-room such as only a master can possess. They were thorough believers in the importance and value of their respective departments, and spared neither pains nor labor to assist and stimulate their students in doing earnest work whenever capacity and interest could be quickened into life. What delightful memories for many a former student cluster around the discussions in the class-room or in familiar conference of some weighty question in which teacher and student came in close fellowship of spirit, and all the rich fund of learning and insight on the part of the former was made available for the use of the latter! The past was made to live again in the present, and the culture of the ancient world shone again with illuminating power into the dark recesses of modern life through the mediation of master minds.

Dr. Dubbs was born and brought up in a typical Pennsylvania German community. On his father's side he came of a distinguished Swiss family members of which, in the old country, have in recent years held high office in Switzerland. From his mother's side he received a strain of Welsh blood. He received a rich inheritance of personal traits, and his surroundings brought him in close touch with the best life of the race to which he belonged. He grew up in an atmosphere of cultured Christian family life so that he was enabled to see and appreciate at their true value the best elements of Pennsylvania German character. He thus had the twofold advantage of being "to the manner born," and of receiving first hand training in the knowledge of the folk-lore and traditions of the Pennsylvania Germans, of which in later life he possessed so rich a store.

Dr. Dubbs received his formal training at school and college under favorable auspices in the Allentown Seminary, Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster and the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg. The first of these institutions was at that time in charge of Dr. Kessler, a man of great ability and a thorough teacher, of whom Dr. Dubbs always spoke with deep affection and respect. Although he was young when he passed through college and the Seminary, graduating from college before he was eighteen, he did excellent work in both institutions and laid the foundation for the large attainments and thorough scholarship of later days. He had a wonderfully retentive memory, unbounded enthusiasm, and unwearied industry; and as he had a wide range of interests he became a proficient scholar in many different branches, including theology and philosophy, art, science and literature. In recognition of his learning he received the degree of D.D. from Ursinus College in 1878, and that of LL.D. from Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio, in 1897. He was also a corresponding member of the Ethnographic Institute of France, and a Fellow of the Historical Society of Great Britain.

It is said that poets are born, not made. The same may be said of historians. Any one with fair capacity may acquire a knowledge of historical facts; but to be a historian is something different. And Dr. Dubbs was a historian. He became such by virtue of his bent of mind, his fondness for research, his retentive memory, his constructive imagination, and his critical insight. He was led thus to the study of history and archæology for the love of it, and his eager pursuit of everything that was rare or curious brought rich results in different fields. When, in 1875, he was elected to the Audenried Professorship of History and Archæology in Franklin and Marshall College, he found a congenial field of labor. He brought to it rare ability for work with solid attainments already made; and he became an acknowledged master in the department. He not only gained a thorough knowledge of

established facts, but by patient investigation and original research he made contributions to historical knowledge of great value. This is especially true of local history, and of the history of the Reformed Church, in which he had few equals and no superiors. He had an accurate and minute knowledge of the planting of the first colonies in this country, particularly in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, of the coming of the first German and Scotch Irish settlers, the establishment of the first churches, and the development of the different religious denominations, and, to his honor be it said, he was never chary in giving information and assistance to other workers in the same fields.

Before he became a member of the college faculty, Dr. Dubbs was an acceptable preacher and pastor. Immediately after his graduation he became his father's assistant, and afterwards served as pastor in Zion's Reformed Church, Allentown, Trinity Reformed Church, Pottstown, and Christ Reformed Church, Philadelphia. He was held in high esteem in these communities, and was frequently honored with high office in the councils of the church. He loved his church with all his heart, and cherished a deep interest in her welfare and prosperity.

Dr. Dubbs performed a vast amount of literary work. He wrote a number of books and pamphlets, and contributed freely to the church periodicals and to historical magazines. He became widely known as a writer, and that his learning and ability were generally recognized is evident from the fact that he was made a contributor to the American Edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia*, *Johnson's Cyclopedea*, *Hasting's Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, *Lossing's American Historical Record*, etc. From 1882 to 1886 he was editor of the *Guardian*, from 1894 to 1895, one of the editors of the *Reformed Church Messenger*. In addition to this he read many papers before historical and literary societies on a wide range of subjects. The following are some of his larger works: *Historical Manual of the Re-*

formed Church in the United States (in 1885) which passed through three editions; "The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania" (1902); "History of the Reformed Church," American Church History Series (1895); "History of Franklin and Marshall College" (1903).

In his college work Dr. Dubbs was an able and inspiring teacher. But he was also an educator in the larger sense. The students admired and respected him for the complete mastery of his subjects and the wide range of his scholarship. His enthusiasm kindled responsive enthusiasm in those who came under his influence. Above all, his geniality of spirit and his personal interest in the students won their confidence and affection in an unusual degree and he will be held in fragrant remembrance by those to whom he gave so large a part of himself in the outgoing of warm affection and helpful personal influence. He was for many years secretary of the Faculty and acting-secretary of the Board of Trustees and twice during the absence of the President of the college in Europe he served as acting President.

No one could meet Dr. Dubbs without coming under the charm of his personality. He was warm hearted and genial, and possessed an inexhaustible fund of anecdotes, the relating of which was in his case a fine art. His social relations were warm and tender, his friendships strong and enduring; and as a man and a citizen he stood for all that is highest and best in our human relations—a type of the true Christian gentleman.

Dr. Kieffer's early years were passed in Central Pennsylvania where his father was an active and faithful pastor of the Reformed Church. He, too, like Dr. Dubbs, was fortunate in having for one of his early teachers a man of more than ordinary ability, whose influence upon his young pupil left its impression for all the subsequent years of his life. This was Aaron C. Fisher, a graduate of one of the New England Colleges, who was then in charge of the old Academy at Mifflinburg. Dr. Kieffer possessed a high order of ability, and his

teacher exacted accuracy in his work and kindled enthusiasm in his studies to a degree that formed the habits of a lifetime and in later years bore the rich fruits of exact scholarship. In 1857 he entered the Sophomore class in Heidelberg College. Here he received his degree with first honors in 1860. During his college course he came under the instruction of Dr. E. E. Higbee, a second factor of great importance in the moulding of his life. After Dr. Higbee's resignation of his professorship, young Kieffer was persuaded to take charge of the department of Ancient Languages in his alma mater, a position in which he remained for four years when he was called to the chair of Ancient Languages in Mercersburg College. Here he was associated with Dr. Harbaugh, Dr. Higbee, and Dr. Thomas G. Apple, partly as student of Theology, partly as colleague in the College Faculty, and these surroundings no doubt constituted a third factor in the making of his career. They account not only for his enthusiastic pursuit of classical studies and his high evaluation of Grecian culture, but also for a wide knowledge of philosophy and theology.

When in 1878 Dr. Kieffer was called to the chair of Ancient Languages in Franklin and Marshall College he was in the full bloom of vigorous manhood. *His reputation as a teacher and classical scholar had preceded him*, and in the larger field of activity now before him he made full proof of his powers. As professor of Latin and Greek from 1878 to 1886, and as professor of the Greek Language and Literature from 1886 to the end of his career he took high rank in his profession and gained an enviable reputation as an exponent of classic culture. In 1888 he took charge of the college library which was badly housed in a room which for a time had been used as a recitation room by the Theological Seminary. Here he went to work with characteristic energy, arranged and classified the books, organized a Reading Room, and virtually created a usable library which has proved a potent factor in the educational work of the college. Afterward in the construction of the De Peyster Library Building and the development of the



Library in its new quarters Dr. Kieffer labored incessantly with self-sacrificing devotion, and the present condition of the Library, into which he put his whole heart as if it were the child of his tender affection, is a monument to his painstaking efforts. For fifteen years he was treasurer of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, and a member of its Executive Committee. He was also a member of the American Philological Association, and of the British Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. He was thus brought in touch with educational workers in a much larger field, and he exerted a far-reaching influence in behalf of liberal culture and of the college of which he was a faithful and distinguished representative. The position among college men to which he thus attained was of especial service to Franklin and Marshall College in helping to secure the establishment of a chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. He was twice sent to the National Council as the representative of the college after formal application for a charter had been made, and it was largely if not wholly due to his eloquent and dignified plea that favorable action was taken and the desired boon was obtained.

Dr. Kieffer was the embodiment of an interesting and forceful personality. Modest in deportment, somewhat sensitive and retiring, he never thrust himself forward, but when called to action he moved with vigor and decision, bringing all the forces of his richly stored mind to bear upon the point at issue. The first impression he made was that of polished and exact scholarship. He detested everything that bore the mark of carelessness or slovenliness, and while he was the soul of kindness to all who he thought were sincerely and honestly working to master the tasks before them, he could be extremely cutting and severe where he felt that boys were lazy or trifling. As a teacher he possessed both power and skill to an unusual degree, and all who had any capacity to appreciate and master the Greek language and literature found rich treasures opened up before them by his master mind. He stood as a type of

classic culture; he loved the literature which he interpreted instinct with life, pervaded by a profound philosophy; and he furnished in our modern system of education that humanistic element which, widened and enlarged by Christianity, is of prime importance in the making of the man of force and influence in our present civilization.

Dr. Kieffer's influence extended far beyond the class-room and the immediate college circle. He was a clear thinker and a master of style in writing. His polished, well-balanced sentences carried with them strong convictions and the fruits of ripe scholarship and reflection, and in this way, by his writings he reached a larger audience. In the community he took a deep interest in everything that made for the comfort and improvement of society. His sympathies were large and generous, his nature intense, his friendships precious and sacred. Indeed the real kindness of his heart and the capacity to love and to serve bloomed out most fully in the circle of intimate friends and associates to whom was vouchsafed a look through the outer shell into an interior of peace and joy and good will.

And now that these two striking personalities are gone from us, we look back with regret. Their places will be filled by others, and no doubt ably filled; but the familiar notes in the harmony of effort sound no more. We cherish the memory of the past. But we also look forward, and with hope and confidence. The fruits of their labors remain, and out of the ashes of the past with the added labor of new workers, there shall spring a more glorious future.

S.

## IX.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**STUDIES IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY. THE CHURCH: IN IDEA AND IN HISTORY.** By A. M. Fairbairn, M.A. New York, Macmillan Company, 1910. Pages xxxii + 635. Price \$3.50 net.

The title of this book, *Studies*, the author defines as a series "of scientific attempts to conceive and represent formulated ideas, not, indeed, according to their place in a system, but in the isolation which was independence." While it is a volume composed of scattered papers, used on different occasions, it is, however, more than a series of disconnected discussions on unrelated subjects. The underlying theme of each Study is the church, its origin, development, and present status. This unity in diversity becomes apparent in the topical arrangement of the material: The first two addresses were delivered from the Chair of the Congregational Union, in the spring and autumn of the same year, and present a comparative study of the Christian religion in the first century and in the nineteenth. The third paper is a treatise on The Sacerdotal and the Puritan Idea, an exposition of the fundamental principles of Episcopacy, Independency, and Presbyterianism. This discussion is one of the most concise and illuminating that we have yet read. In the second part of the volume, the *Studies* are devoted to the New Testament idea of the Church,—its main function or worship, its founders and its making. These are followed by others on the teaching of Jesus as the standard of the church's living, on what Jesus intended His church to be, and an account of His passion as its foundation. The last six chapters treat of Paul and John, the apostles being taken as specimens of the material Jesus used in building up His church.

One need not read far to discover the point of view of the author. He writes as a representative of Congregationalism. He expresses his high regard for "an institution which testifies to the continuous speech and presence of God with man, which awes by its past, its monuments, its comely and impressive worship; while it wins us by the many sweet yet ardent spirits among its living sons, and by the treasured memories of the saintly men who have loved it and lived for it." Thus he pays his tribute to the Anglican Church. On the same page, however, he states his grounds for nonconformity: "Our reasons for dissenting from the Church of England are too fundamental to be merely or mainly ecclesiastical. We dissent because we believe that she fails adequately to interpret and realize for the people of England the religion of Christ." As a theologian, he writes from the view-point of an historical critic. Those who have read his book, entitled *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, will understand his receptive attitude toward the result

of critical scholarship, and at the same time his genius for the reconstruction and readjustment of the truths of the gospel. The spirit of humble trust, of deep devotion, and of fervent hope pervades each chapter. His scholarship is suffused by his faith.

He is a master of epigrammatic and antithetic statements. His extensive reading and his extraordinary knowledge of facts enable him to generalize with authority. As a teacher, an author, and one of the most distinguished scholars of England, he is justified in collecting his unpublished papers and presenting them in this form to the public. The book will be cordially welcomed by students of theology and history and by men of every creed as a notable contribution on the great historical and theological issues of our time.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**GREAT ISSUES.** By Robert F. Horton. New York, Macmillan Company, 1909. Pages vi + 384. Price \$1.50 net.

*Great Issues* is a book of twelve chapters on the following topics: Myths, Religion, Morality, Politics, Socialism, Philosophy, Science, Theology, Literature, Art, Life, and Death. While these subjects have been worn threadbare, the author has successfully avoided platitudinous and commonplace treatment. He writes as one who has read widely, thought deeply, and reached definite conclusions. He has the subtle charm of style which is so indispensable to an essayist. He addresses himself to the cultured reader in all lands, and brings to bear the present day ideas on the perennial issues of life. From beginning to end the essays are replete with epigrams, old truths in new forms, suggestive statements, and illuminating illustrations. While few men have a right to ask the attention of the reading public on such a large variety of subjects, Dr. Horton has proven himself worthy of his task, and his essays will have a claim on the attention of readers in the English-speaking world.

Of the many passages which one might quote to illustrate the point of view of the author, a few must suffice. Of Myths he says: "When Plato desired to utter some truth which lies deep in the mystery of being he was accustomed to glide into what he called a myth. Such myths, 'truths embodied in a tale,' are among the masterpieces of his style, or, one might say, of all literature. He uses the myth, not to avoid speaking truth, but in order to speak it. There was no other medium through which he could convey realities which belong, not to the phenomenal, but to the noumenal world." Since we are told by literary critics of the Bible, that there are myths even in the Old Testament, such statements become less offensive in the light of this definition. That the author is a liberal theologian, and insists on the recognition of the results of science and criticism in the interpretation of the Scriptures, is in evidence in each chapter. Still he shows firm confidence in the perpetuity of religion. He

feels himself surrounded by mysteries which keep alive and nourish the religious nature of men. He quotes with approval the passage from *The Non-religion of the Future*, by M. Guyau: "Materialism leaves us, as other systems do, in the presence of that ultimate mystery which all religions have symbolized in their myths, and which metaphysics will always be obliged to recognize and poetry to express, by the instrumentality of images." He also finds evident satisfaction in Tyler's plea for readjustment in religion: "Unless a religion can hold its place in the front of science and morals, it may only gradually in the course of ages lose its place in the nation, but all the power of statecraft and all the wealth of temples will not save it from eventually yielding to a belief that takes in higher knowledge and teaches better life."

So delicate and difficult a subject as Socialism he treats, from the standpoint of a Christian minister, with the skill of a master. He defines it as the "application of our religion to industrial organization and to State life." Indeed, the theological dogma, "One is your father, even God, and all we are brethren," he considers fundamental both to religion and to socialism. While the book is valuable for intelligent readers of every class, it will be especially helpful to the minister of the gospel, who is constantly discussing one or the other of the phases of life treated in these essays.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**THE BOOK OF EASTER.** With an introduction by the Rt. Rev. W. C. Doane, and imaginative drawings by George Wharton Edwards. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1910. Pages xvii + 246. Price \$1.25 net.

*The Book of Easter* is a companion volume to the *Book of Christmas*, which was noticed in the last January number of the REVIEW. Both in form and contents it maintains the same high standard. The introduction by Bishop Doane is a discussion of the relation of Easter to Christmas, and to the fears and hopes of human life. It recognizes the mystery of the Easter fact, and yet finds in it the most reasonable consummation of the life of man. "Resurrection," he says, "means the coming back to the immortal life of the collective personality, with all its physical faculties and attributes, having shed its mere fleshiness; as a grain of corn sheds its hard shells, a butterfly its chrysalis, a silkworm its cocoon, and a bird its discarded egg, to be no more chrysalis or shell or cocoon or egg, but to be that for which these were but temporary coverings, the true life being all the while within. This is the resurrection of mercy; the other would be only the resurrection of misery."

The contents are divided under six heads: I, Before the Dawn; II, Easter Days; III, Easter Hymns; IV, Easter Stories; V, Golden Trumpets; VI, Awake, Thou That Sleepest. Under

each heading there is a collection of extracts from the anicent and the modern classics, in prose and poetry, in song and story.

Under the first topic passages are taken from the Book of Job, the Book of Hezekiah, the *Antigone* of Sophocles, etc., to illustrate how the Ancients thought of death. The Easter stories, six in number, are selected from prominent English, French, German, Russian, and American writers. Fifteen Easter hymns are presented some by ancient, others by mediæval, and still others, by modern writers. The manner of observing Easter in different countries and the Easter customs are described in the second part. Thus every phase of Easter is brought to the attention of the reader in the most artistic and fascinating way. Twelve plates of the master paintings referring to the Easter story are interspersed through the pages. It is a book that will interest children and one which ripe age will ponder with profit. As a gift book for Easter it is not easily excelled.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

CHINA AS I SAW IT. A woman's letters from the Celestial Empire. By A. S. Roe. New York, The Macmillan Company. Cloth. Illustrated. Pages 331. Price \$3.00 net.

As the title indicates, this work consists of a number of letters written by a lady traveling in China to her friends in the homeland. These letters cover a period of over two years. A glance at the map will show that the author traveled far beyond the beaten tourist path. Not only Shanghai, Chefoo, Tienstin, Peking, Hankow, Wuchang, Nanking, and such well-known cities are visited and described, but her trips also extended northwest into the province of Shansi, and up the Yangtze River to Ichang, on through the dangerous gorges to Chungking, and from thence to Chentu, the capital of Szechwan. From this it will be seen that the travels of the author were very extensive, even though confined to central and northern China.

The descriptive powers of the author are very good. The reader travels with her in the palatial Yangtze steamers, tosses in the Chinese houseboat on the turbulent and exceedingly dangerous gorges of the same river above Ichang, and shares the delays and discomforts of travel by China's new railroads, by chair, by mule litter, by mulecart, and by wheelbarrow. And not only are her descriptions excellent, but it is evident that the author asked questions at the different mission stations she visited, and that to good purpose, so that the book is full of interesting information. However, there are a few places in which it would have been better if the author had trusted her eyes, thus avoiding such mistaken generalizations as the following: "No place is too poor, no hilltop too inaccessible, no river bed too shifting, no trouble too great for Chinese industry." The reviewer has traveled quite frequently on the Yangtze River over part of the route which the

author covered and from the deck of the steamer has seen more than one terraced hill, evidently cultivated in years gone by, but now no longer in use. This tendency to generalization crops out in a few other places, especially in glowing descriptions of Chinese character. It were well if travelers in general would avoid such sweeping generalizations, as it always tends to misunderstanding and misinformation. At the same time the author gives very good descriptions of the life of the people both at home and abroad, and it is from these descriptions and from her actual experiences with the people that a very good idea can be formed of the strength and weakness of Chinese character.

The author shows her nationality by the use of several English terms not familiar to English-speaking people of other nationalities, by the use of English money terms in comparing values, and by declaring that Shanghai is "under British rule." These instances are few, however, and do not detract from the value of the work.

The illustrations are very good. Several of them are copies of native drawings, thus giving the reader a good idea of the Chinese conception of art. The others are photographs of places of interest visited by the author in her travels. The work of the publishers and printers is good and in appearance the book is attractive.

To any one wishing to get a view of China such as one gets while traveling, a view of her great cities and myriad peoples, of her industry and sloth, of her luxury and misery, of her beauty and her filth beyond description; to such a one the reviewer would recommend this work as both interesting and instructive.

J. FRANK BUCHER.

YOHOW CITY, HUNAN, CHINA.

A SECOND YEAR OF SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN. By Florence U. Palmer. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 259. Price \$1.25 net.

This series of Sunday-school Lessons by Mrs. Florence Palmer King presents an unusually attractive appearance, and has many claims upon the attention of parents and teachers. There are fifty-two lessons on suitable topics, based on the seasons of the year and the festivals of the church. The topics are carefully selected and they are developed in successive lessons in an intelligible and impressive way so that the children are easily interested. For instance, taking up the winter season, the topic is Love, and this is presented in five lessons, each having a Central Thought, a Text, a Picture, and a Song. The lesson is taught by means of a story taken either from the Bible or from history. The pictures are gems in their way, not mere apologies for pictures. Most of them are copies of pictures by the great masters of art, old and new, from Michael Angelo and Murillo to Doré, Hofmann, Plockhorst, Bodenhausen and Bonheur. The



author evidently feels the importance of selecting the *best* material available under each head.

JOHN S. STAHR.

A MODERN CHRONICLE. By Winston Churchill. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1910. Pages 524. Price \$1.50.

In his latest novel of American life Mr. Churchill has achieved a masterpiece. Tales like *Richard Carvel*, *The Crisis*, *Coniston* and *Mr. Crewe's Career* have marked the several stages of his progress as a delineator of periods, of conditions, and of types in our national existence. A born story-teller and a wholesome moralist all his books have shown him to be. It is in the perfection of his art as an analyst and a revealer of human motive that each succeeding work has exhibited a steady and sure development. This, his latest study, is marked by a subtlety and insight, by a deftness of handling and a sureness of touch, that belong only to the man who has mastered his art.

The title, *A Modern Chronicle*, is happily chosen; for the story is nothing if not modern. The scene is laid partly in the Middle West and partly in the East. The action begins in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and is unfinished (for the reader, at least, when he lays down the volume) in the year 1910.

Honora Leffingwell, the heroine, is a charming creation. Endowed by nature with beauty, grace, wit and that mysterious quality called "temperament," she is, despite her early surroundings, destined to a life other than commonplace. These fortuitous gifts, be it understood, are complemented by certain positive moral traits that make of her a woman to be always admired, though often pitied. That she should love and be loved, is part of her fate. That she enlists the reader's sympathy from the moment of her appearance and holds it through the vicissitudes of an unusually turbulent career, is sufficient proof of her worth as a woman.

The story is vital; its chapters pulsate with the life of today. Real men and women here play their parts and enact for us a drama of surpassing interest. Comedy and tragedy, humour and satire, persiflage and epigram engage us equally by turns. In its delineation of certain contemporary types, in its handling of certain delicate problems peculiar to our twentieth-century civilization, this book displays marvellous power. To read it attentively is to understand much that may before have seemed incomprehensible.

Mr. Churchill is a moralist, as he is an artist, of the first order. He teaches by the presentation of concrete examples, by the revelation of real conditions, by the conflict of contending forces in the highly complex and delicately-organized society of his own land and time. In his page right is right and wrong is wrong. There is no glazing of vice; there is no rhapsodical

praise of virtue. The offender against moral law suffers the inevitable punishment—if not in his fortune, then in his spirit and temper; the doer of righteousness as surely enjoys his own reward. As a preacher of domestic and social virtue, no less than of the ethics which should control commercial and political life, Mr. Churchill is unsurpassed by any living novelist. To appreciate all this, one must read attentively and with a serious mind his latest and greatest book: *A Modern Chronicle*.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

**WESTERN WOMEN IN EASTERN LANDS: An Outline Study of Fifty Years of Woman's Work in Foreign Missions.** By Helen Barrett Montgomery. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages xvi + 286. 50 cts. net.

This is the tenth volume of a series of mission-study books issued by the Central Committee on the United Study of Missions, the first volume having appeared ten years ago. The purpose of these publications is to present an Outline Study of Missions from the time of the Apostles down to the present century. The demand for these books greatly exceeds the highest hopes of the committee and of the publishers, more than half a million copies having been sold. This is proof of the need for the series, and also of the satisfactory and superior character of it.

This latest volume, which marks the jubilee of Woman's Foreign Mission Work, sets forth the start, the task, the work, the workers, and the product of Women's Foreign Missions. It also presents the outlook for the future, the problems which must be met, and the agencies which must be developed. These topics are treated in six chapters, or studies, which are replete with facts and which are entitled as follows: I., What Our Mothers Have Told Us; II., Ladies Last; III., Missionaries at Work; IV., The Women Behind the Work; V., The New Woman of the Orient; VI., Problems and Policies. At the end of each chapter is a list of helpful questions, Bible readings, and reference books. The volume is carefully indexed and contains a valuable statistical table.

The style and treatment of the entire subject are almost above criticism. From the literary point of view the work is so excellent that it puts to shame the careless, faulty, equivocal diction used by many clergymen in the pulpit and in their writing.

After having read a few pages of this book, no woman is likely to lay it aside before every page has been carefully studied; and no man who reads it and is willing to give woman her dues, will dispute her just claim to a full share of the honor belonging to those who take part in the evangelization of the heathen world. But more important than either of these things is the fact that no one can read this book without getting a quickened interest in the work and deciding to do more for it. All these Mission-Study volumes should be placed within easy reach of every member of the church.

J. R. BROWN.

